

PROJECT VISIONING

SR-12 Context Sensitive Committee (CSC)

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) has initiated a Context Sensitive Committee of 12 individuals in January 2005 to continue involvement with previous studies for SR-12 and to participate in identifying and developing the transportation needs and context of the surrounding areas. The specific section of SR-12 that will be addressed by this Context Sensitive Committee includes the corridor of existing SR-12 from Escalante to Boulder.

The challenge introduced to the diverse members of the Context Sensitive Committee is to “brainstorm” ideas, concerns, needs, issues, and culture that exist in this area. The valuable input learned from these “brainstorming” sessions will lend itself to developing a “Project Vision” for SR-12.

Each committee member is provided the opportunity to represent the diverse issues of the public and to participate in the transportation decision-making process for SR-12 from Escalante to Boulder by assisting UDOT in defining the following:

- Context
- Needs
- Evaluation Criteria
- Preliminary Alternatives
- Preliminary Alternative Evaluation

The Utah Department of Transportation extends a sincere thank you to each of the Context Sensitive Committee Members for their time and commitment to this committee.

THANK YOU!

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Minutes

To: Attendees and Invitees Date: March 29, 2005

From: H.W. Lochner

Project: SR-12 Environmental Assessment
STP-0012(8)60E

Meeting Location: Escalante Community Center
Escalante, Utah

Subject: Context Sensitive Committee Kick-off Meeting

The SR-12 Project Team and the members of the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on February 23, 2005 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. in Escalante, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District
Joe Gregory, Federal Highway Administration
Laurel Hagen, (sitting in for Liz Thomas) Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Jeanne Harshman, Boulder Town Council
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Clare Ramsay (sitting in for Dell LaFevre), Garfield County Commission
Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner

Project Team Members:

Tyler Robirds, H.W. Lochner
Randi Shover, H.W. Lochner
HG Kunzler, H.W. Lochner
Amber Cypers, H.W. Lochner
Tod Wadsworth, Wadsworth Design Group

Additional Attendees:

Daryl Friant, Utah Department of Transportation
Jeff Berna, Federal Highway Administration
Julie Brugger, Escalante Resident

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda) (all items mentioned that need to be addressed at future dates and meetings were clustered in a "parking lot" to be revisited at a later date. Those items are listed at the end of this summary):

1. *Welcome*

- Tyler Robirds of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees. Mr. Robirds gave a brief overview of Lochner and its role on this project. He also stated that the project team's goal for this project is to seek a balanced solution. He then introduced the meeting facilitators, Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne, and turned the time over to them.
- *Review Agenda and Logistics*
 - Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne welcomed the committee members and thanked them for taking the time to attend. They let the committee members know that the purpose of the meeting was to define the "context" of SR-12. They then proceeded to review the day's agenda.

2. *Committee Member Introductions*

- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked each of the committee members the following three questions:
 - *Who are you?*
 - *What is your vision of the project area?*
 - *What project interests do you represent?*
- The following are the committee members' responses to the above three questions:
 - **John Mavor:** Originally from Vermont, John Mavor is representing the bicycle community. He built a home in Escalante and has spent a great deal of time bicycling on or near the project area. With the increase in traffic, Mr. Mavor sees that a few things need to change. The area needs to grow to fit the increasing need.
 - **Sharol Bernardo:** Having taught high school for 28 years, Sharol Bernardo moved to Garfield County in 1988. Ms. Bernardo is representing the Garfield County Travel Council and she currently owns two businesses in Escalante. She envisions a future for the young people in the community by increasing economic and commercial development in the established towns.
 - **Joe Gregory:** Originally from Tennessee, Joe Gregory is representing the Federal Highway Administration. Mr. Gregory envisions a road that will meet the traffic demands while maintaining visual appeal. He also would like to see a sound environmental document result from this process.
 - **Rick Torgerson:** Born and raised in central Utah, Rick Torgerson is representing the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Mr. Torgerson wants to make sure the right thing gets done on this project. He envisions a project that all communities are proud of and that addresses the vision that each person/group brings forth, not just UDOT's.
 - **Sue Mosier:** Having moved to Garfield County in 1971, Sue Mosier is representing the Boulder/Escalante Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Mosier doesn't want to see the road change much, but perhaps it could be a little safer while still maintaining visual appeal. She also represents, on a more personal level, motorcycle riders on SR-12.

- **Allysia Angus:** Allysia Angus is a Landscape Architect and Land Use Planner for the US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument. Ms. Angus is also currently serving as the Secretary/Treasurer for the Scenic Byway 12 Committee. She envisions a safe and even more beautiful road for locals, bikers, tourists, etc. She would like to enhance drivers' experiences by taking the time to "do better."
- **Marlene Stowe:** Born and raised in Escalante, Marlene Stowe is representing the Escalante City Council. Ms. Stowe wants what is best for the community. She doesn't want the road to change too much, but can see where some improvements can be made.
- **Clare Ramsay:** (attending on behalf of Dell LaFevre) Clare Ramsay is currently a Garfield County Commissioner and a rancher. Mr. Ramsay envisions a safe road that enhances what is already there.
- **Jeanne Harshman:** Having first come to Garfield County in 1953, Jeanne Harshman has lived in Boulder for 15 years and is representing the Boulder Town Council. Ms. Harshman envisions a road that honors the history and culture of the communities. She would like to see people traveling safely across the road.
- **Vard Coombs:** Born and raised in Boulder, Vard Coombs is representing the Garfield County School District. Mr. Coombs has driven the school bus between Escalante and Boulder for 30 years. He is content with the road but can see where problems are for others. He has seen more and more accidents since the Monument was established.
- **Jim Catlin:** Jim Catlin is representing Wild Utah Project and the conservation community. Mr. Catlin sees SR-12 as the life-blood of the county. It is one of the most scenic routes in the country. He is looking at this project with a comprehensive approach. The process of this committee offers a great opportunity.
- **Laurel Hagen:** Laurel Hagen is representing the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. Ms. Hagen's vision for the road is to do only what is absolutely necessary. She considers SR-12 one of her favorite roads.

3. *Define Meeting Ground Rules*

- Meeting ground rules were defined as follows:
 - Take turns speaking and respect others when they are talking.
 - Recognize that, even if we do not agree with it, each of us is entitled to our own perspective.
 - Request a break when we need to.
 - Turn cell phones off during the meeting (*New*)
 - Share any comments with the entire committee (*New*)

4. *Project Background Discussion*

- *Previous Documents*
 - In 1973, a study was conducted called *The Escalante River Basin: Problems and Issues*. Jim Catlin provided a copy of the study.
 - In 2000, the Utah Department of Transportation conducted the *SR-12 and SR-63 Corridor Transportation Plan*. Rick Torgerson gave an overview of the study.
 - The plan was done for the entire SR-12 corridor and a small stretch of SR-63.

- The *SR-12 and SR-63 Corridor Transportation Plan* included an extensive public involvement program that included public comments and public hearings.
- The document in its entirety is on the project web site in the following location under *SR-12 and SR-63 Corridor Transportation Plan*:
<http://www.udot.utah.gov/sr-12/public.htm>
- In 1996, the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument was formed and the *Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Management Plan* was published. Allysia Angus spoke briefly about this study.
 - In the *Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Management Plan* SR-12 is referred to as a “special recreation management area” and the WSA’s were addressed.
 - The project study for safety improvements along SR-12 is consistent with the Management Plan.
 - The document is available in its entirety on the project web site in the following location under *Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument Management Plan*:
<http://www.udot.utah.gov/sr-12/public.htm>.
- In 2001, the *Scenic Byway 12 Corridor Management Plan* was conducted by the Five County Association of Governments on behalf of Wayne and Garfield Counties. Allysia Angus spoke briefly about this study.
 - In this study, Scenic Byway and All-American Road status were sought and obtained.
 - Safety is a big issue covered in the *Scenic Byway 12 Corridor Management Plan*. The goal of the management plan is to make sure SR-12 accommodates all the different modes of transportation.
 - The document is available in its entirety on the project web site in the following location under *Scenic Byway 12 Corridor Management Plan*:
<http://www.udot.utah.gov/sr-12/public.htm>.
- *Current Studies*
 - Comments made on previous and current studies:
 - Allysia Angus: An interpretive signing plan is being prepared for the BLM. The study is being conducted by a consultant and will be complete by June 2005.
 - Rick Torgerson: The document that is being prepared now is not a planning study like the ones previously conducted. This study is in a scoping phase that will lead to implementing changes that need to take place.
 - Sharol Bernardo: All press releases that refer to SR-12 need to refer to it as a state road *not* a federal road.
 - Jim Catlin: Two other aspects that need to be taken into consideration on this project: utility usage of the road and right-of-way issues.
 - Jeanne Harshman: Cattle issues also need to be taken into consideration. What is “open range?” Who has jurisdiction over the road for open range issues?
 - Daryl Friant: UDOT and FHWA have jurisdiction over the road for transportation issues. Land management issues such as cattle and open range fall under BLM’s jurisdiction.

5. *Project Process / National Environmental Policy Act Discussion*

- Laurel Hagen: Who is the lead agency on this project?

- Michelle Fishburne: The Federal Highway Administration is the lead agency and the US Bureau of Land Management is a cooperating agency.
- NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, is the process by which this study will be conducted. The NEPA process is as follows:
 - Early agency and public coordination.
 - Draft Purpose & Need identification.
 - Preliminary inventory of affected environment.
 - Identify and evaluate conceptual alternatives.
 - Assess potential impacts.
 - Select and prepare NEPA document (EA vs. EIS)
 - Decision
- In order to provide quality and informed decision for the project, the agency and public involvement process will run parallel to the NEPA process to ensure all input is taken into consideration and reviewed by the agencies and the public. Currently the project is in the “early coordination” stage and includes the development of the Context Sensitive Committee to focus on the project area needs and potential solutions.

6. *Context Sensitive Solutions Discussion*

- The goal of this first meeting was to define context. Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne asked the committee: What is context?
 - Context is the circumstances in which an event occurs; a setting.
 - What goes into a setting?
 - Physical area
 - Natural environment
 - Community values
 - Historical events
 - Cultural characteristics
 - Economics
- Jim Catlin: It is important for the committee to also understand how UDOT makes decisions, what the culture is of how those decisions are made, and the process of how roads are built. This will allow the committee to better understand the institutional context of how transportation projects get complete.
 - Rick Torgerson: Historically, decisions were scientific and utilized local area knowledge to define needs in the area. Within the last five years UDOT has implemented a more context sensitive solutions (CSS) approach to projects. UDOT gathers scientific data through their process and then tries to determine the needs of the area as well as the needs of the environment and communities that the road goes through. This allows for a process to analyze the different aspects of a project. This process can be started during a project or prior to a project being funded. In this case, UDOT has decided to take a broad approach look at SR-12 specifically between Escalante and Boulder to analyze all aspects of this scenic route.
- Additional comments made:
 - Allysia Angus: What are the logical termini for this project? (the project extents)
 - Kim Clark: Hell’s Backbone Road in Escalante to the Burr Trail turn-off in Boulder. At this time, the logical termini will not go through the towns.

- Jeanne Harshman: Pull-offs will be essential to the highway and need to be assessed.
- John Mavor: The only group not represented on this committee is tourists.
 - Kim Clark: We had comment forms available at various visitors' centers this last fall and we will have more comment forms available again this spring. The project team has also received a number of email comments from out-of-state individuals that are interested in the SR-12 project.
- Jim Catlin: Defining road user etiquette is an important aspect of this project.

7. *Exercise: Define Project Area Context*

- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne asked the committee to brainstorm as individuals and come up with a description of SR-12 and its surroundings for someone that had never driven or seen the road. They then split the committee up into groups of two to discuss and then present what they had described. The descriptions were written on post-it notes and placed on a large board. The descriptions were as follows:
 - Laurel Hagen and John Mavor: Great views, slick rock canyon, hike – get out of the damn car!, wild and quiet, cool small road, great motorcycling road, great driving road, dangerous road
 - Sharol Bernardo and Joe Gregory: Incredible scenery, you can see for miles, long distance views – on a clear day you can see forever, clear night skies, evidence of history and pre-history, very windy, slow driving, evokes passion
 - Rick Torgerson and Sue Mosier: Highway 12 is scenic and diverse, primitive, emotional experience, history, tourism, attractions, awe, excitement and fear, safety and commuters
 - Allysia Angus and Marlene Stowe: Pioneer history, changes through the years, quality of light – the colors, distant views, memorable drive, winding, steep, narrow roads, beautiful, Hogsback, canyons and mountains, self-reliance
 - Jeanne Harshman and Clare Ramsay: Scenic, unique – no other place like it, historic, exhilarating and spooky, well paved, many turns, “it’s a hell of a place to loose a cow” –*Ebenezer Bryce*
 - Vard Coombs and Jim Catlin: Home, history, solitude on a horse, this is a place that is a symphony of sky, stone, and water
- Additional words committee members used to describe the SR-12 area that Kim and Michelle posted on the large board:
 - Quiet
 - Views
 - Hiking
 - Commuters
 - “Coombs Site”
 - Ranch History
 - Big area – walking perspective
 - History
 - Primitive areas
 - Experiences
 - Unique history
 - Tribal culture
 - Creamery route

- Scenic
- Beautiful
- Canyons
- Museum
- State Parks
- Country solitude
- Geological value
- Water
- See so . . . far
- Tourism
- Petroglyphs
- Great driving
- Mountains
- Road to get there
- Anasazi history
- Emotional experience
- Mule trails
- Slow
- Speechless – driving at night
- Dangerous – severity of accidents
- Has everything
- Walk to experience
- Not as many conveniences
- Ranchers
- Big
- Awe
- More than a road
- Campgrounds
- Points of interest
- Archaeology
- No people
- Cultural values

8. *Existing Road Conditions Discussion*

- HG Kunzler and Amber Cypers of H.W. Lochner gave the committee an overview of the existing road conditions. They also discussed the fourteen critical review elements that are utilized when a road is studied.
 - Fourteen critical review elements:
 - Posted speed
 - Travel lane widths
 - Shoulder widths
 - Horizontal alignments (curves on roadway)
 - Vertical alignments (crests and valleys on roadway)
 - Grade of roadway (how steep is the roadway)
 - Sight distance (how far ahead of me can I see)
 - Cross section (slope on the side of the roadway, obstructions close to roadway)

- Superelevation (how steep is the bank on a curve)
- Structural capacity (structural rating of bridge)
- Vertical clearance (overhead obstructions)
- Bridge width
- Crash data
- Pavement conditions
- SR-12 existing conditions:
 - Posted speed: Ranges from 30-60 mph. Warning signs 20-40 mph.
 - Travel lane widths: Generally 11-12 ft.
 - Shoulder widths: Range from 0-10 ft. (Generally 2-3 ft.)
 - Horizontal alignments (curves on roadway): 97 horizontal curves. Curves speed range from 20-75 mph.
 - Vertical alignments (crests and valleys on roadway): 90 vertical curves. Curves speed range from 30-80 mph.
 - Grade of roadway (how steep is the roadway): Range from 0.06-14.38% (Generally 6-8%)
 - Sight distance (how far ahead of me can I see): Horizontal sight distance – 16 of 97 curves have horizontal sight distance less than 30 mph.
 - Cross section (slope on the side of the roadway, obstructions close to roadway): Maps identify location of slopes 3:1 or steeper. (A 3:1 slope does not allow a car to recover if it goes over it. The car will either go to the bottom of the slope of roll.) Guardrail/Barrier does not have proper end treatments.
 - Superelevation (how steep is the bank on a curve): Ranges from 2-8%. Super does not extend through entire curve.
 - Structural capacity (structural rating of bridge): Escalante River Bridge – Rating 84.3 = Good Condition; Calf Creek Bridge – Rating 58 = Deteriorated; Boulder Creek Bridge – 82.9 = Good Condition.
 - Vertical clearance (overhead obstructions): Appears adequate.
 - Bridge width: Calf Creek and Boulder Creek have obstructions within the clear zone.
 - Crash data: 81 total crashes from 1994 and 2003.
 - Pavement conditions: Sub-grade is mostly strong. Pavement is in poor condition – previous report recommends rehabilitation. Near RP 75.3 guardrail/metal pipes is supporting pavement.
- Comments regarding existing road conditions:
 - Jeanne Harshman: How many accidents have been on the Hogsback? Amber Cypers: 5 in the last 9 years.
 - Jim Catlin: Speed is a social issue – not an engineering issue. Different solutions to the accidents that have happened due to speeding, drunk driving, etc. should be pinpointed. HG Kunzler: We can't engineer a road for those that choose to break the law or drive drunk. We can only look at the existing road conditions and make the road safer and more consistent.

9. *Exercise: Project Area Conditions and Concerns*

- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne divided the committee into three groups of four people. Each group was given a map of the project area and GIS data. The groups were

asked to write their concerns on the maps in the corresponding locations. The groups were as follows:

- Group 1: Rick Torgerson, Clare Ramsay, Marlene Stowe, Jim Catlin
 - Group 2: John Mavor, Jeanne Harshman, Sue Mosier, Allysia Angus
 - Group 3: Vard Coombs, Joe Gregory, Sharol Bernardo, Laurel Hagen
- The concerns are as follows:
- Group 1: High speed pedestrian issue near high school, passing zones in certain areas (**exact locations on attached maps**), widen road for bicycles, intersection improvements near Hole-in-the-Rock, pullouts/short passing zones in certain areas (exact locations on maps), issue of speed at Boynton Overlook, turn lane to Kiva Koffee House, possible rumble strips before sharp turns to slow drivers down, short RV passing lanes in certain areas (exact locations on maps), straighten curves in certain areas (exact locations on maps), aesthetic retaining walls, bicycle pullouts in certain areas (exact locations on maps), upgrade intersection to Calf Creek, more appropriate replacement to Jersey barrier, improve all overlooks, Hogsback safety options.
 - Group 2: (Following identification of their concerns, Group 2 proceeded to determine what is needed to address those concerns. They wrote the needs on a flip chart. **See attached map for groups 2 and 3 for a copy of flip chart.**) Pullouts for hikers, parking for recreational purposes, safe passage for cyclists, fix Calf Creek Bridge, fix where pipes and barriers are supporting the road, creative and effective deterrents to speeding, address cattle/wildlife crashes, sort out the right-of-way, possible rumble strips.
 - Group 3: Crosswalks at high school, be aware of WSA boundaries, need for passing lane at certain points (**exact locations on attached maps**), turn lane into Kiva Koffee House, sight distance limited in certain areas (exact locations on maps), straighten curves at certain points (exact location on maps), icy in certain spots (exact locations on maps), retaining walls near Calf Creek and Escalante River, falling rock near Calf Creek, possibility of slope falling into Calf Creek Campground, increase superelevation (banking) in certain areas (exact locations on maps), natural waterfalls coming off cliffs – don't rock cut (exact locations on maps), cows on the Hogsback November through February, possible rest stop near the Hogsback – provide information about the roadway and slowing down, deer in open range near the Hogsback and the turnoff to Hell's Backbone, signage for slowing down (exact locations on maps).

10. *Context Sensitive Committee Business*

- *Set Next Meetings*
 - The next three committee meetings will be as follows:
 - April 21, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Boulder, Utah
 - June 1, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Escalante, Utah
 - August 9, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Boulder, Utah

- *Modifications to Charter*
 - Sharol Bernardo will officially be replacing Bruce Fullmer for the Garfield County Travel Council.
 - Added to the charter: “Any dissent made by a committee member on recommendations made to the project team will be taken into consideration.”
- *Sign the Charter*

11. *Next Meeting*

- *Project Vision*
- *Evaluation Criteria*

Additional Ideas

- Rumble strips
- Utilize the old road as a bike trail
- Parking options and hiking access
- Signing: speed concerns/additional research
- Right-of-way
- Education: bicycle uses
- Flattening vertical curves
- Pullouts

Parking Lot Items

- Future Utilities
- Sharol Bernardo: Changing the lanes through the town of Escalante from four lanes to two lanes.
 - Rick Torgerson: If there isn’t a capacity issue, then changing the number of lanes through town is a matter of restriping the lanes and the town can make that request to UDOT.
- Jim Catlin: Defining road user etiquette is an important aspect of this project.
- Evaluation of accidents: social vs. physical road conditions
- Transportation projects.
- Sharol Bernardo: Garfield County tourism, crosswalk near Escalante High School.
- Management of cattle – legal issue of open range.
 - BLM vs. UDOT

THANK YOU!

The previous summary is the writer’s interpretation of the meeting discussion. If there are any discrepancies or items that need clarification or correction, please notify Kim Clark or Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner.

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Minutes

To: Attendees and Invitees Date: May 25, 2005

From: H.W. Lochner

Project: SR-12 Environmental Assessment
STP-0012(8)60E

Meeting Location: Boulder Town Hall
Boulder, Utah

Subject: Context Sensitive Committee Meeting #2 (April 21, 2005)

The SR-12 Project Team and the members of the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on April 21, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Boulder, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District
Joe Gregory, Federal Highway Administration
Laurel Hagen, (sitting in for Liz Thomas) Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Keith Gailey, Boulder Town Mayor (sitting in for Jeanne Harshman, Boulder Town Council)
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Committee Members Not Present:

Dell LaFevre/Clare Ramsay, Garfield County Commission and Ranching Community
Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner

Project Team Members:

Andrea Clayton, H.W. Lochner
HG Kunzler, H.W. Lochner
Randi Shover, H.W. Lochner
Mike Brehm, Brehm Environmental
Steve Trimble, Words and Photographs

Additional Attendees:

Robert Dowell, Utah Department of Transportation
Daryl Friant, Utah Department of Transportation
Julian Hatch, Boulder Regional Group
Scott Brody, Boulder Town Resident (sitting in for part of the meeting on behalf of the Mayor)

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda) (all items mentioned that need to be addressed at future dates and meetings were clustered in a "parking lot" to be revisited at a later date. Those items are listed at the end of this summary):

1. *Welcome*

- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees. They gave an overview of the new materials for the committee members' notebooks. The new materials included information from the open houses that were held the previous night, a new comment form, and the agenda for the day's meeting.
- Review Agenda and Logistics
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne proceeded to review the day's agenda. They informed the committee members that they would continue on with the exercise from the previous meeting since many of the members didn't have a chance to complete the *Project Area Conditions and Concerns Exercise*.

2. *Updates Since Last Meeting*

- *Committee Comments on Meeting Minutes*
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked each of the committee members if they had any comments on the meeting minutes that they had received. The only comment came from Michelle Fishburne on clarifying the term mule trails vs. mule trains that was brought up at the first meeting. It was clarified that mule trails was the intended meaning.
- *Committee Member News*
 - John Mavor contacted cycling businesses. The individuals that he spoke with are advocates for cycling businesses and groups being able to tour on SR-12. He said they want to make sure the corridor remains open for cyclists. He also stated that the individuals that he spoke with were very passionate about the whole of SR-12 from Panguitch to Torrey.
 - Allysia Angus brought up the issue of open range and fencing. She stated that the permittee, BLM, and UDOT are all responsible parties when it comes to open range on or near SR-12. If a motorist hits a cow on the roadway, the liability comes back to the permittee. She also spoke about the grazing study that is currently being conducted by BLM. It is in alternative development now. The grazing study is not addressing open range issues.
 - Sharol Bernardo stated she heard from a couple of individuals who reported that along the road near Calf Creek where the Jersey Barrier has been placed, the road is very narrow especially when a large vehicle is coming in the opposite direction. Sharol also noted that the barriers and some natural material have been sloughing off onto the roadway.
 - Jeanne Harshman is moving to Texas and will not be able to sit on this committee. Mayor Keith Gailey has replaced her for the time being.
- *Update on Project Activities*
 - Parking Lot Issues:
 - **Utilities:** To be determined
 - **Management of cattle, open range:** Currently the subject of a document for BLM

- **Transportation Projects:** Information and a copy of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program is available at www.udot.utah.gov/index.php/m=c/tid=40
- **2 lanes vs. 4 lanes in Escalante City limits:** UDOT and Escalante to determine separately from this project (not directly relevant due to the logical termini)
- **Tourism:** To be determined
- **Evaluation of accidents: social vs. physical road conditions:** Addressed as part of the roadway discussion later in the meeting
- **Crosswalks near Escalante High School:** To be determined
- Proposed Wilderness Boundaries
 - Jim Catlin has provided GIS data on the wilderness areas proposed by the Utah Wilderness Coalition. Andrea Clayton will coordinate with Mr. Catlin on this matter.
- Archaeological Report
 - Montgomery has completed a review of existing documentation of approximately 250 archaeological sites near the corridor.
- Public Open Houses
 - Public open houses were held in Escalante and Boulder on April 20th. The objectives for the open houses were as follows:
 - Refine Understanding of Context
 - Identify Needs
 - Develop Evaluation Criteria
 - Brainstorm Possible Solutions
 - The public was given the opportunity to write their comments down on maps. The maps and comments from the open houses were presented to the CSC members.
- Roadway Design Standards
 - The project team is in the process of collecting standards from various agencies. Roadway design standards for SR-12 have not yet been defined. The team will also collect standards from the National Park Service.
- Overview of project schedule
 - The project team would like to have a draft purpose and need statement available by the next committee meeting in June.
 - The project team will meet with the public and the committee again in August at the end of Phase I. The project will then lead into Phase II.
- Allisia Angus informed the committee and project team about the Scenic Byway 12 Celebration that will take place in Cannonville on August 27th from 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Maintenance Activities
 - Robert Dowell, the Region 4 Richfield District Director for the Utah Department of Transportation, spoke to the committee regarding road maintenance issues and activities. He discussed the following:
 - Due to recent heavy rainfall and material sloughing into the roadway prism, maintenance activities have been necessary on SR-12 while the current environmental process continues.
 - One of UDOT's obligations is to maintain what they have. The following maintenance activities will continue to take place: maintaining drainages ensuring that inlets and outlets are open, crack sealing for pavement, cleaning cut ditches, and performing erosion control.

- The recent work in the Calf Creek area was due to debris and material sliding. The fill should not have been placed in the area that it was. The fill material may have to be removed though Mr. Dowell is concerned that removing it may cause more damage than leaving it where it is. Fill will no longer be placed beyond the existing slopes without first obtaining environmental clearance. The challenge will be to continue to maintain the area and find areas to place the fill. UDOT does not want to waste the material and they will haul it when necessary to make sure it gets utilized.
- Vard Coombs asked Mr. Dowell what the problem is with where the fill has been placed. Mr. Dowell responded by saying that there is sensitive vegetation in the area and that it is inappropriate to place fill in riparian areas without getting prior authorization. Mr. Coombs stated that the same thing was done on the Hogsback and that's the reason that it is as wide as it is now. Mr. Dowell responded by saying the Calf Creek area is very sensitive and the sediment could run into the stream.
- Jim Catlin asked whether UDOT has a document on what the protocol is for this sort of issue. Mr. Dowell stated he is not aware of a specific document but they do have guidelines they need to follow. He also stated that anytime maintenance reaches beyond the shoulders of the roadway the appropriate environmental measures (such as BMPs) need to be taken. Jim Catlin asked how UDOT handles beaver dams and herbicides. Rick Torgerson responded by stating UDOT doesn't typically encroach channels or streams during maintenance activities; they don't have jurisdiction over waters of the U.S. Robert Dowell added that there are standard practices on application of herbicides. Daryl Friant stated that the Division of Wildlife Resources can blast the dams if they are causing damage to a roadway. They (UDWR) would need to obtain a stream alteration permit and need to work with ACOE. Usually the federal agency does the removal.
- Robert Dowell requested the committee provide input on what cross sections would be desirable, relative to both use and maintenance. Even the narrow, sensitive cross section from the Escalante River to Calf Creek needs to be maintained. The committee could also identify areas for future pullouts so maintenance crews could deposit material in those areas. The work for widening could be started in those areas without utilizing project funds. He also stated he would like guidance on what maintenance crews can do.
- Sharol Bernardo asked Mr. Dowell if UDOT maintenance differentiates natural vs. non-natural material. Mr. Dowell responded by stating they would try to reuse natural material where practical and allowable, but non-natural materials (concrete, pavement) would not typically be placed in riparian areas. He also noted there are two different situations. 1. Erosion problems: put material in whatever they can use. It is done in conjunction with UDWR and stream alteration permits. 2. Emergency situations: they may get the permit after the fact.
- Jim Catlin asked if there is a difference in whether the stream body is a functioning fishery. Robert Dowell stated that UDOT instructs maintenance crews to stay out of all streams. Daryl Friant stated that the reasons include

water quality and stream alteration. One of the interested agencies includes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

- Laurel Hagen stated that there are better ways to shore up the shoulder as opposed to loosely placing soil and rock in a riparian area that could allow sediment into the stream. She commented that a couple of possibilities would be to either remove the slope or re-vegetate and compact the slope to prevent sediment from going into the stream.
- Robert Dowell informed the committee that he has informed the maintenance crews how to properly handle this issue.

3. *Group Exercise (same groups from last meeting)*

- Kim Clark then moved into the exercise from the previous meeting. She stated that not all groups had a chance to finish the activity. She also asked each group to look more closely and specifically at distinct areas. She asked each member to identify areas that are sacred to them and the community, and to label them on the project maps. Because Group 2 finished the exercise at the first meeting, they were asked to assess the comments from the public open house maps and identify the needs from the public.
 - Maps were then laid out on each table and the committee members got back into their groups from the previous meeting. However, Marlene Stowe and Dell LaFevre/Clare Ramsay from Group 1 were not at the meeting. To make the groups more even, Sharol Bernardo moved from Group 3 to Group 1. The groups were as follows:
 - Group 1: Rick Torgerson, Jim Catlin, Sharol Bernardo
 - Group 2: John Mavor, Keith Gailey, Sue Mosier, Allysia Angus
 - Group 3: Laurel Hagen, Vard Coombs, Joe Gregory
 - Comments were recorded on project mapping.

4. *Project Purpose and Need Discussion*

- Following the group exercise, Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne discussed and defined purpose and need.
 - The purpose is defined as the *objective* of the project.
 - The needs are defined as *problems* that exist (based on factual data).

The project needs that Group 2 identified at the previous meeting were discussed. They are as follows:

- Inadequate number and design of pullouts for hikes/recreation parking (vehicles are parked on the road).
- Safe passage opportunities for cyclists are inadequate.
- Calf Creek Bridge banks are eroding.
- Structural supports and barriers are inadequate, unsightly and occupying critical roadway prism.
- Traffic is moving too fast in certain locations.
- Hazards represented by cattle and wildlife entering the roadway are unacceptable.
- Right-of-way conditions impede UDOT's ability to maintain the roadway.

5. *Group Exercise – Part 2: Identify Project Needs Exercise*

- Each group was then asked to present what needs (sometimes articulated in the form of associated objectives and possible solutions) they have identified. Group 2 identified needs, based on its interpretation of the public open house comments. The needs from each group are as follows:
 - Group 1:
 - Make sure there is enough height clearance for large vehicles under the dark red cliff near Calf Creek. The perception is that it is not high enough and large vehicles are darting into the other lane.
 - Mitigate extreme speed changes. Make speed transition zones for areas between a high to low speed change.
 - Use an aesthetic approach to structures, walls, barriers, etc. Lower the height of the barriers.
 - Need for parking restrictions.
 - Maintain visual appeal for highway and non-highway users.
 - Create uphill bicycle pullouts/lanes (where conducive).
 - Create passing pullouts/lanes.
 - Put the utilities underground.
 - Create better/more interpretive sites.
 - Group 2 (based on public comments from open houses):
 - Protect archaeological and paleontological sites (i.e. dinosaur tracks).
 - Reduce speed.
 - Evaluate safe ingress and egress (specifically at businesses and trailheads).
 - Provide maintenance notification.
 - Widen in some areas for safety.
 - Improve aesthetics of (safety) barriers.
 - Bicycle safety.
 - Safety signing (ice, deer, cows, etc.).
 - Group 3:
 - Turnouts near scenic or slow areas. (Maybe a foot path along Hogsback.)
 - Hogsback safety.
 - Opportunities for passing.
 - Make improvements with minimal impact.
 - Force people to slow down (signs, bumps, etc.).
 - Rebuild Calf Creek Bridge.
 - Bike safety.
 - Use universal signage (i.e. graphic depicting a car with rocks falling on it) for non-English speaking tourists and visitor's.
 - Do not make it look over engineered.
 - Following the break for lunch, Ms. Fishburne and Ms. Clark summarized the comments from the committee members regarding needs. They are as follows:
 - Pullouts/recreation parking (move parked vehicles off road)
 - Bicycle safety
 - Fix Calf Creek Bridge
 - Fix where pipes/barriers are supporting road
 - Parking restrictions/locations

- Maintenance opportunities/notifications
- Protect archaeological and paleontological sites
- Address cattle/wildlife crashes
- Right-of-way
- Slow traffic down (some areas)
- Passing opportunities (pullouts)
- Minimal impacts
- Safety – ingress/egress Hogsback, signage, height clearance/widening
- Aesthetic solutions/approach – on- and off-road views, underground utilities
- Waysides/interpretive sites (incorporate information into pullouts)

6. *Evaluation Criteria Discussion*

- What is it? It is a way to measure performance.
- Why is it important? It defines the indicators used to determine if something is working as intended and to compare options.
 - Evaluation Criteria:
 - The framework for evaluation criteria is identified by: corridor needs, vision, and context
 - Evaluation criteria also takes into account: safety standards, regulatory requirements, impacts to natural and human environments, consistency with project vision and area context
 - Evaluation criteria framework: at this stage in the project, the evaluation criteria will:
 - Measure effectiveness of the solutions in meeting needs
 - Assist in defining the data needs
 - Focus the project study efforts
 - The framework of evaluation criteria will not change as we progress through the project. However, the evaluation criteria will:
 - Evolve
 - Become more detailed
 - Ultimately include specific impacts to compare alternatives
 - When screening evaluation criteria the committee members were asked to think about what the project objectives are and what the needs are. Ms. Clark passed out color coded tables with evaluation criteria listed. To understand the process of evaluating alternatives, she asked the committee to take into consideration the following questions:
 - Does the preferred alternative need to take into consideration all? some? of the project needs listed? Are there some needs that are more important than others?

Break for lunch

7. *Committee Exercise: SR-12 Evaluation Criteria Exercise*

- A question for Group 1 was raised regarding one of the needs they listed. They listed “interpretive sites” as one of their needs and Michelle Fishburne asked them to clarify the meaning. Rick Torgerson responded by saying their team would like to see more interpretive sites incorporated into the pull offs/turnouts to tell the story of the area.

- Allysia Angus then inquired about what the official term is for the little bubbles/spots off to the side of the road that slow vehicles can move over and let faster moving traffic pass by. Rick Torgerson said they are called “pullouts”.
- When screening evaluation criteria, a person must focus on the outcomes that they believe are the most important and decide what they want to use as minimum performance standards.
- Ms. Fishburne discussed the project vision as defined by the CSC members and how those became project objectives. Boards with the CSC members’ project visions listed were shown to illustrate how the visions aided in defining and developing some of the project objectives. John Mavor noted that several of the objectives could be considered as needs. Michelle commented that there is some overlap, and that for now, the project team wants to make sure the intent of the visions were captured. Jim Catlin added that distinguishing between objectives and needs can be difficult. The objectives discussed are as follows:
 - **Objective 1:** Preserve the history and contribute to the culture of the community
 - **Vision:** A project communities are proud of, the best for the community, maintain SR-12 as the life blood of the community, contribute to a future for the young, honor the history and culture of the communities
 - **Objective 2:** Meet the transportation demands, improve safety
 - **Vision:** Meet the traffic demands, grow to fit the increasing traffic, some improvements, make a little safer, travel safely across, a safe and more beautiful road
 - **Objective 3:** Preserve the natural environment
 - **Vision:** Do only what is absolutely necessary, limit changes
 - **Objective 4:** Maintain the character of the road
 - **Vision:** Maintain character of the road, enhance experiences
 - **Objective 5:** Maintain the visual appeal
 - **Vision:** Maintain visual appeal
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members for their comments on what the objectives and visions should be. The comments were are follows:
 - **Change Objective 1:** Contribute to the *economics* and culture of the community.
 - **Change Objective 2:** Meet the *varied* transportation needs.
 - Jim Catlin brought up the objective of “prevent the establishment of new, conflicting back-country uses (such as bike paths in the WSA).” Some of the committee members asked for clarification on the term “back-country” and Mr. Catlin redefined this to “off-highway.” The other committee members stated that the statement was too vague and confusing. Ms. Fishburne suggested looking at it from a project need standpoint instead of as a project objective.
 - Jim Catlin raised a concern with the vision in Objective 3. He stated that the word “necessary” is too broad. Ms. Fishburne stated that the comment came from Laurel Hagen at the first meeting and asked her if she wouldn’t mind clarifying what she meant. Ms. Hagen sated that she meant only make minimal changes. After much discussion, including considering and then eliminating the use of the phrase “in deference to”, a few group members suggested “meet the needs of” might best address this concern with Objective 3.
 - **Change Objective 3:** *Meet the needs of the natural environment.*
 - **Change Vision:** *Prevent conflicting uses in the area (i.e. WSA’s).*
 - **Change Objective 5:** Maintain and *enhance* the visual appeal.

- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne then reviewed the project objectives and comments as defined by the general public. They are as follows:
 - **Objective 1:** Improve ability to perform adequate maintenance operations.
 - **Comments:** Better maintenance, road needs to be resurfaced, concern regarding road conditions, maintenance should be good quality and subtle, identify long-term solutions for maintenance, eliminate need for frequent small maintenance projects.
 - **Objective 2:** Balance the needs of the different modes of transportation.
 - **Comments:** Tourist traffic is difficult, slow moving trucks and RVs, summer traffic is really heavy for the size of the road, and there is a safety problem when it comes to bicycles. The bike safety issue includes both factual and perceived elements.
 - **Objective 3:** Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway.
 - **Comments:** Turnouts are needed, no more ugly barriers, improvements need to be sensitive in order to preserve landscape quality, provide an alternative route for traffic to avoid Calf Creek and reduce traffic in Boulder. Consider input from law enforcement representatives familiar with user behavior on the corridor.
 - **Objective 4:** Preserve water resources.
 - **Comments:** Preserve Calf Creek.
 - **Objective 5:** Incorporate science, research, and facts into the decision making process.
 - **Comments:** Use science, research, and facts when making decisions.
 - **Objective 6:** Improve safety on SR-12.
 - **Comments:** Address safety along SR-12, other areas along SR-12 need improvements, dangerous curves located near Boulder, danger from cattle on the road.
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members for their comments on what the objectives from the public should be. The comments were are follows:
 - **Change Objective 1:** Improve ability to perform adequate maintenance operations *appropriate to the place.*
 - **Change Objective 3:** Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway *and environment.*
 - Jim Catlin inquired whether safety improvements include more law enforcement. The project team responded by stating that creative solutions that are outside highway design solutions can certainly be considered.
 - **Change Objective 5:** Incorporate science, research, and facts into the *open* decision-making process.
 - John Mavor brought up the issue of bicycle safety and the difference between actual and perceived safety. He postulated concern for bicyclists could come from motorists who have to make a split decision or quick maneuver when they come up on a bicycle on SR-12. That “perception” needs to be addressed.

8. *Typical Roadway Standards*

- HG Kunzler gave an overview of typical roadway standards and some of the data that the project team has gathered. The information is as follows:
 - Traffic counts:
 - Current AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) (2002) = 1240
 - 2012 AADT = 1767

- 2022 AADT = 2477
 - 2030 AADT = 3500
 - Crash data breakdown:
 - Drunk driving related accidents = 1
 - Vehicle problem related accidents = 4
 - Driver error related accidents = 17: speed too fast 19: improper lookout 12: misc.
 - Wild animal related accidents = 12
 - Domestic animal related accidents = 10
 - Allysia Angus asked whether accidents related to domestic animals have decreased since fencing was placed. Mr. Kunzler said he would look into it further. Ms. Angus also noted that the accidents listed are only the accidents that have been reported. There have been many more unreported accidents.
 - Mr. Kunzler then went on to give an overview of design criteria. He stated that there are certain guidelines provided that help engineers make good decisions and develop roads in a well-thought out manner. Tests have been performed on the criteria to help ensure the accuracy and that geometry is taken into consideration.
 - Design criteria for SR-12 have not yet been set. The guidelines will help everyone understand what should be taken into consideration.
 - Shoulder widths are one of the areas of concern on SR-12. Standard shoulder widths are 2 ft. to 8 ft. Shoulder widths on SR-12 tend to be between 0 ft. and 3 ft. As a rule, shoulders do not have to be paved. They just have to be a stable surface that a vehicle can safely traverse.
9. *Group Exercise: Understanding of and Input on SR-12 Design-Criteria Exercise*
- Following the design criteria overview, the committee members were given templates with appropriate design speeds designated on them. The committee members were asked to view the six segment maps of the SR-12 corridor between Escalante and Boulder that had been laid out on the tables and determine solutions for those segments. They were each given a handout to write their solutions on. In the interest of time, each committee member was asked to start with the segment that they are most passionate about and then move from there. Comments have been captured on the maps.
 - Following the exercise Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked each committee member to identify one solution from their list and share it with the committee. They are as follows:
 - Rick Torgerson: Put a parking lot on the north end of the Hogsback and allow one lane of traffic during high tourist season. Utilize the other lane for bicycle and pedestrian access. Allysia Angus noted that this would be fairly easy and cost-effective to test.
 - Laurel Hagen: Put in a walking path along the Hogsback in addition to the two lanes of traffic.
 - Allysia Angus: Put in a cantilever path along the Hogsback for bicycle use. Also use flashers letting motorists know there is a bicyclist on the road.
 - Jim Catlin: Place a Utah Highway Patrol car on the corridor with a mannequin in it. Some of the committee members made the comment that they didn't feel this approach would add to the experience.
 - Scott Brody: There is a safety issue coming up out of the Calf Creek area. Eliminating the pullout on the east side of the road would help. Change the way

people use the pullout. Address access safety at all of the pullouts and points of attraction.

- Sue Mosier: Put in a deceleration lane approaching Hole-in-the-Rock road.
- Sharol Bernardo: Add warning signs for drastic speed changes (i.e. 35 mph 800 feet ahead). Try putting the signs in the pavement itself with color variations instead of off to the side of the road where it can obstruct views.
- Joe Gregory: Just after Head-of-the-Rocks, straighten the sharp curve but leave existing curve/road as a pullout.
- John Mavor: Put in an interpretive site/pullout for the trail up to Bolington Road near Head-of-the-Rocks.
- Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne wrapped up the exercise and stated that it would be revisited at the next meeting to allow the committee members to finish identifying solutions.

10. *Context Sensitive Committee Business*

- *Status of CSC Goals*
 - The following items have been covered so far:
 - Context
 - Needs
 - Evaluation Criteria
 - Preliminary Alternatives
 - The evaluation criteria chart will be updated with comments from the day's meeting.
 - Ms. Clark and Ms. Fishburne asked the committee members what they would like to hear more about at the next committee meeting. The answers that were provided are as follows:
 - Allysia Angus: workable copies of the maps would be great. The project team will provide copies of the maps in 11x17 format for the next meeting. Power lines and GIS data with WSA information will be added to the maps.
 - Jim Catlin would like law enforcement issues and speed data covered. John Mavor stated that there are less intrusive ways to mitigate speed than more policemen. Allysia Angus said it would be helpful to have a half an hour interaction with law enforcement and EMS.
 - Jim Catlin suggested that the committee members bicycle the corridor to gain a better understanding of the road from that point of view. It was determined that a field review would be conducted prior to the next meeting.
- *Next Meeting*
 - May 31st: field review beginning at 1:00 p.m.
 - Hike, bike, and drive the corridor
 - Meet at the Moqui Motel in Escalante
 - June 1st: CSC meeting #3 in Escalante
 - Logistical information will be forthcoming

Parking Lot Items:

- Guidelines for maintenance activities
- Change in frequency of wildlife related crashes after BLM installed fencing
- Perceived vs. actual safety for bicyclists

THANK YOU!

The previous summary is the writer's interpretation of the meeting discussion. If there are any discrepancies or items that need clarification or correction, please notify Kim Clark or Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner.

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Minutes

To: Attendees and Invitees Date: August 8, 2005

From: H.W. Lochner

Project: SR-12 Environmental Assessment
STP-0012(8)60E

Meeting Location: Escalante Community Center
Escalante, Utah

Subject: Context Sensitive Committee Meeting #3 (June 1, 2005)

The SR-12 Project Team and the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on June 1, 2005 from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in Escalante, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District
Joe Gregory, Federal Highway Administration
Laurel Hagen, (sitting in for Liz Thomas) Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Keith Gailey, Boulder Town Mayor
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Committee Members Not Present:

Dell LaFevre/Clare Ramsay, Garfield County Commission and Ranching Community
Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner (not present)

Project Team Members:

Tyler Robirds, H.W. Lochner
Andrea Clayton, H.W. Lochner
HG Kunzler, H.W. Lochner
Randi Shover, H.W. Lochner
Crystal Garstang, H.W. Lochner
Tod Wadsworth, Wadsworth Design Group

Additional Attendees:

Myron Lee, Utah Department of Transportation
Daryl Friant, Utah Department of Transportation

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda):

1. *Welcome*

- Kim Clark of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees. She gave an overview of the new materials for the committee members' notebooks. The new materials included information regarding the vision and context of the SR-12 area and the agenda for the day's meeting.
- Review Agenda and Logistics
 - Ms. Clark proceeded to review the day's agenda. She informed the committee members that they would continue on with the exercise from the previous meeting since many of the members didn't have a chance to complete the committee exercise from meeting #2.

2. *Updates Since Last Meeting*

- *Committee Comments on Meeting Minutes*
 - Ms. Clark asked each of the committee members if they had any comments on the meeting minutes that they had received. No comments were given. A copy of the final meeting minutes were distributed to the attendees.
- *Committee Member News*
 - Allysia Angus stated that the interpretive sign master plan that is being conducted on behalf of the BLM will be complete in a couple of months. Kim Clark inquired whether there would be a meeting signifying the end of the project. Ms. Angus stated that there would be a review period. Ms. Angus also mentioned the SR-12 Scenic Byway celebration on August 27th and the grand opening of the Escalante Visitor's Center on June 11th.
- *Update on Project Activities*
 - Parking Lot Issues:
 - **Guidelines for maintenance activities:** To be determined with UDOT.
 - **Change in frequency of wildlife related crashes after fencing was installed:** Fencing was installed during 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 from approximately RP 62-69. Crash data is available through 2003. H.G. Kunzler reported that no domestic animals have been lost since the fencing project was completed.
 - **Addition of National Park Service (NPS) design criteria:** The NPS design criteria has been added to the SR-12 Design Criteria Chart. H.G. Kunzler noted that the NPS standards are based on AASHTO standards. More detail on this item will be covered later in the meeting.
 - **Perceived safety vs. actual safety:** To be determined.
 - **Utilities:** To be determined.
 - **Tourism:** To be determined.
 - **Crosswalks near Escalante High School:** To be determined.

- Proposed Wilderness Boundaries
 - Transparencies of the wilderness areas proposed by the Utah Wilderness Coalition and BLM have been done for the six segment maps. The boundaries that are printed directly on the maps are where the Wilderness Study Areas are located.
- Draft Purpose and Need Statement
 - A draft outline for the Purpose and Need statement has been created. The outline is currently undergoing a review process by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), the US Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
- BLM Signing Information
 - Refer to Allysia Angus' comment under *Committee Member News* for information regarding BLM signing information.
- Design Criteria
 - The design criteria chart has been updated. Design criteria will be discussed more in-depth later on in the meeting.
- Speed Study Update
 - The GRAMA Act must be utilized to gather specific information from the speed study that was conducted on SR-12. The project team is currently in the process of trying to obtain that information.
 - The posted speed limit is generally determined by the 85th percentile speed.
 - Jim Catlin asked how many roads in Utah are posted at/or above the 85th percentile speed. H.G. Kunzler stated that the project team is looking into that.
- Emergency and Public Safety Services
 - Kim Clark introduced the emergency and public safety services representatives to the committee. They are as follows:
 - Cindy Steed, Squad Leader – Escalante Ambulance Corp.
 - Sgt. Danny Perkins, Chief Deputy – Garfield County Sheriff's Office
 - Lt. David Excell – Utah Highway Patrol
 - Don Porter, Fire Chief – Escalante Fire Department

3. *Public Safety Services Presentation:*

- The project team asked the emergency and public safety service representatives to speak to the committee regarding their experience with SR-12 between Escalante and Boulder:
 - John Mavor, the bicycle representative on the committee, asked Lt. David Excell what the best/easiest way the large bicycle groups can get in touch with the Utah Highway Patrol so they can understand the rules of the road.
 - Lt. Excell stated that the cyclists have as much right on the road as vehicles do. He stated that there have been no bicycle fatalities but there have been accidents. The potential for disaster is always there.
 - Lt. Excell stated possible solutions for this issue would be to have temporary portable signing at the beginning and ending posts of the bicyclists route to alert motorists that there is bike traffic in the area.
 - The question of having a Utah Highway Patrol member escort the large groups was raised. Lt. Excell stated that the Utah Highway Patrol does not have enough resources to provide escorts.

- Lt. Excell stated that planning for large groups will help and that communication is the key.
- Kim Clark asked each of the committee members to introduce themselves and who they represent on the committee. She asked that each member ask a question, if they had one, to the emergency and public safety representatives. The questions/statements are as follows:
 - Laurel Hagen asked if this section of Highway 12 has a low accident rate, then why is this section of the corridor considered dangerous?
 - To answer Laurel Hagen's question, Lt. Excell stated that the average driver regulates their speed to match the potential danger and that is probably why there is a lower accident rate on this stretch of SR-12. It is the drivers that don't adjust their driving that end up with tickets or in accidents.
 - Allysia Angus stated that groups that are part of organized, commercial trips that make stops on public lands (i.e. campgrounds, hiking trails, etc.) must obtain a special recreation permit from the appropriate public land management agency. The size of those groups may vary. Large organized rides that are tied to a benefit and consist of tens to hundreds of riders must also get special recreation permits from the appropriate public land management agency if they go onto public land for any purpose. These large groups are also required to obtain a permit from UDOT. She suggested that the touring companies that organize the bike tours need to pass on information to their customers regarding proper use of the roadway.
 - Rick Torgerson stated that UDOT has a difficult time monitoring the bicycle groups. He also stated that UDOT is responsible for alerting the Utah Highway Patrol if an escort for a bicycle group is needed.
 - Sharol Bernardo suggested signs with flashing lights that state "Slow Traffic Along Route – March 1 through November 1" be placed on the corridor. Lt. Excell stated that signing is a UDOT issue.
 - Rick Torgerson stated that the large vehicle mix and seeing substantial growth in large vehicle usage is one of the issues the committee is looking into further.
 - Allysia Angus stated that large vehicles coming from Red Canyon turn around when they see the tunnels because they are afraid of hitting them. Permits are required for vehicles that size and they are informed ahead of time about the conditions.
 - Sharol Bernardo asked Lt. Excell whether they planned to patrol the area more during high tourist season. Lt. Excell stated that there just isn't enough manpower.
 - The question was raised as to how many sheriff's officers there are in Boulder and Escalante. Sgt. Danny Perkins stated that there is one officer in Boulder and one in Escalante.
 - Allysia Angus inquired as to what sections of the corridor the emergency and public safety members see needing safety improvements. Chief Don Porter stated that the area near Head-of-the-Rocks needs attention. Sgt. Perkins stated that, where space is available, bike paths, pullouts, and wider shoulders would address most of the problems on the corridor.
- Lt. Excell asked the committee if they are interested in the type of accidents he sees. The committee responded with yes. The types of accidents the Utah Highway Patrol sees on this stretch of road are car rollovers, car hits mountainside, car hits tree,

motorcycle tips over, car hits delineator post, bus sideswipes embankment - to name a few.

- H.G. Kunzler asked whether accidents reported by the Garfield County Sheriff's office get recorded in the state database. Sgt. Excell stated that they do not. The project team will add the accident data from the county to the state's information. Chris Hatch was named as the contact for the county.
- Kim Clark then gave an overview of the project and that the committee has identified the needs on the corridor and they are now moving into possible solutions. She asked whether there were any other questions or concerns the committee members wanted to discuss with the public safety services representatives. The additional questions are as follows:
 - Sharol Bernardo asked whether emergency vehicles will go off highway to attend to an emergency. For example, Hole-in-the-Rock Road. Cindy Steed stated that they would go if the road was well-maintained. She stated that Hole-in-the-Rock Road is maintained.
 - Sharol asked the public safety services representatives where they see a need for pullouts along the corridor. Don Porter stated that when there is an accident on the corridor emergency crews either have to close one lane or close the road completely. Pullouts are needed anywhere they can be added. He stated that anything to help get vehicles and equipment out of the road would be useful.
 - Vard Coombs stated that he has issue with motorcycles on the corridor. He said he never sees them go the speed limit and he never sees them pulled over. He inquired as to whether motorcycles are regulated like regular vehicles. Sgt. Perkins stated that they are regulated the same. However, there are areas along the corridor that law enforcement officers can't turn around to chase down a speeding vehicle – motorcycles and cars alike. He stated that the police end up becoming more of a hazard on the road trying to turn around and chase after a speeder than just the speeder alone.
 - John Mavor asked what the public safety services representatives would do to change the highway. Sgt. Perkins stated that he would put in a bike trail where the space is available, like in Red Canyon. He realizes that there is not enough space to put in a bike trail along the whole corridor between Escalante and Boulder, but anywhere one can be put in would be helpful. Sgt. Perkins also would like to see wider shoulders throughout the corridor. The danger to pull over in some areas is high and sometimes it is not worth the risk pulling someone over in those areas.
 - Allysia Angus inquired about right-of-way usage on the corridor by ATVs. Rick Torgerson responded by stating that UDOT has sent letters to all cities in Region 4 asking them to delineate a master street plan for ATV use. UDOT prefers to keep all trails outside of UDOT right-of-way. Mr. Torgerson stated that ATVs can be used within state right-of-way to get supplies and fuel but not to get from point A to point B.

4. *Revisit Committee Exercise from Meeting #2*

- At this point in the meeting the committee was broken up into groups of two in order to continue working on the exercise from committee meeting #2. The groups are as follows:
 - Rick Torgerson and Laurel Hagen

- Vard Coombs and Sue Mosier
- John Mavor and Jim Catlin
- Allysia Angus and Keith Gailey
- Sharol Bernardo and Joe Gregory
- The corridor between Escalante and Boulder has been broken down into six segments based on posted speed. Each group viewed corridor maps of each of these segments. They were then asked to look at the following items and determine what was appropriate for the area based on design standards:
 - Appropriate Speed
 - Appropriate Lane Width
 - Appropriate Shoulder Width
 - Appropriate Radius
 - Appropriate Vertical Curves
 - Appropriate Clear Zone/Clear Zone Treatments
- Committee members were also asked to identify possible solutions and constraints for each segment. The outcome of this exercise is outlined in an additional document titled *CSC Suggested Alternative Criteria*.

Break for lunch

5. *Draft Purpose and Need Discussion*

- The schedule for the draft Purpose and Need report is as follows:
 - Purpose and Need Outline: June 2005
 - Purpose and Need Statement: August 2005 (available by the next CSC meeting.)
- The purposes for the project define why the project is being done. The purposes have been identified as follows:
 - Preserve and maintain the human and natural environment.
 - Provide improvements along SR-12 which enhance and maintain the context of the communities.
 - Identify safety transportation improvements along SR-12 from Escalante to Boulder while maintaining the character of the roadway and scenic nature of the project area.
 - Improve UDOT's ability to provide "adequate" maintenance operations to sustain SR-12 as a safe facility for the public traveling from Escalante to Boulder.
 - Meet the varied transportation needs.
 - Balance the needs of the different modes of transportation on SR-12.
 - Provide "long term" solutions related to the travel demands and safety between Boulder and Escalante.
 - Clarify the goals, needs, regulations, and long-term plans of project partners related to the SR-12 corridor.
- The needs are a way of measuring "Have we met the goals?" The needs have been identified as follows:
 - Meet current and future changes in transportation uses along SR-12 from Boulder to Escalante.
 - Accommodate diverse transportation modes on SR-12, including: cars, trucks, RV's, buses, automobiles, motorcycles, and bicycles.

- Establish controls for varying speeds associated with the different modes of transportation.
- Provide solutions that address areas of high accidents.
- Accommodate several different user types on the roadway: local, commuters, tourists, trucking, deliveries, recreation, ...
- Provide for growth and change in communities in the project area.
- Establish collaborative efforts and potential commitments between BLM and UDOT regarding maintenance, right-of-way, and the future needs along SR-12.
- Improve appropriate existing roadway deficiencies related to standard safety criteria.
- Obtain sufficient right-of-way for UDOT to maintain SR-12 as a safe and cost effective transportation facility.
- Reduce the potential for impacts to the natural and human environment from the frequent “small, limited, short-term maintenance fixes” along SR-12 from Escalante to Boulder.
- Identify efficient borrow and waste sites for roadway maintenance and materials.
- Minimize impacts to the human and natural resources.
- All the needs will be a part of the document. All information will be accommodated. The Purpose and Need will be used to screen the alternatives. When screening alternatives, the questions to ask include: Is it feasible? Does it meet the Purpose and Need?

6. *SR-12 Design Criteria Discussion*

- On May 31st, the CSC members were invited to participate in a field review along with the project team. Following the review, members of the committee and project team hiked and bicycled the corridor to gain a better understanding of the area. A summary of that review is in a separate document.
- Guidelines have been established as national standards when it comes to designing a roadway. For the SR-12 corridor, the project team has collected standards from the following sources:
 - AASHTO
 - UDOT
 - US Forest Service
 - UDOT 3R's (Reconstructing, Resurfacing, Rehabilitating)
 - AASHTO Bike
 - National Park Service
- These standards and the range provided in the standards and design exceptions, or waivers, give flexibility in design based on the context and environment of the corridor. The context of the SR-12 corridor is different from one reference post to another.
- In the previous exercise, the project team had the committee members fill out a worksheet based on what the members believed would be appropriate speeds, lane width, etc. (See description under item #4 above.) The project team then compiled the results on a chart to determine the range of ideas from the committee members. The ranges are as follows:
 - For speed, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: 55-60 MPH
 - Segment 2: 30-35 MPH
 - Segment 3: 30-55 MPH
 - Segment 4: 25-55 MPH (some speeds are advisory for sharp curves)

- Segment 5: 35-55 MPH
- Segment 6: 30-55 MPH
- For lane width, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: 12 feet
 - Segment 2: 11-14 feet
 - Segment 3: 11-14 feet
 - Segment 4: 10-12 feet
 - Segment 5: 11-12 feet
 - Segment 6: 11-14 feet
- For shoulder width, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: 4-8 feet
 - Segment 2: 2-8 feet
 - Segment 3: 2-6 feet
 - Segment 4: 2-8 feet
 - Segment 5: 4-8 feet
 - Segment 6: 3-5 feet
- For radius, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: 35-60 MPH
 - Segment 2: 30 MPH
 - Segment 3: 30-55 MPH
 - Segment 4: 35-55 MPH
 - Segment 5: 35-55 MPH
 - Segment 6: 35-55 MPH
- For vertical curves, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: The current vertical curves are appropriate
 - Segment 2: The current vertical curves are appropriate
 - Segment 3: The current vertical curves are appropriate
 - Segment 4: The current vertical curves are appropriate
 - Segment 5: The current vertical curves are appropriate
 - Segment 6: The current vertical curves are appropriate
- For clear zone, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: The current clear zone is appropriate
 - Segment 2: The current clear zone is appropriate
 - Segment 3: 6 responded that current clear zone is appropriate. 2 responded that current clear zone is not appropriate
 - Segment 4: 3 responded that current clear zone is appropriate. 4 responded that current clear zone is not appropriate
 - Segment 5: The current clear zone is appropriate
 - Segment 6: The current clear zone is appropriate
- For vertical clearance, the committee's suggested range is:
 - Segment 1: The current vertical clearance is appropriate
 - Segment 2: The current vertical clearance is appropriate
 - Segment 3: The current vertical clearance is appropriate
 - Segment 4: 2 responded that current vertical clearance is appropriate. 3 responded that current vertical clearance is not appropriate
 - Segment 5: The current vertical clearance is appropriate

- Segment 6: The current vertical clearance is appropriate

7. *CSC Preliminary Alternatives Discussion*

- Allysia Angus asked if bike paths/lanes are added in some sections on one side of the road, how do cyclists transition to the other side of the road when the lane ends?
 - John Mavor and H.G. Kunzler stated that it would have to be made clear through signing. Jim Catlin suggested utilizing a pullout at the end of a bike path for cyclists to wait at until the road is clear. John Mavor stated that the signs should be very clear that cyclists should not cross the road until it is clear.
 - Laurel Hagen suggested separating the bicycle traffic from the motorists with a two foot retaining wall.
 - John Mavor stated that consistency is the key. Using a four foot shoulder width should be done throughout the corridor. He does not want to compromise safety.
- Kim Clark asked the committee members how they feel about removing rock to create wider shoulders or a bike lane. Jim Catlin suggested using a three foot shoulder along the corridor with a retaining wall that is built on the outside of the road.
- Kim Clark then asked whether constructability is an issue. Allysia Angus stated that some areas would be okay and some would not. It is all based on location – what is above you? Ms. Angus stated that she would like to see visual simulations of the solutions that have been suggested from a driver's perspective. What would it look like? Tod Wadsworth suggested first looking at what solutions are feasible and then look further into what they would look like from a driver's perspective.
- H.G. Kunzler stated that when looking at solutions, if an existing curve meets design standards for a curve within 15 MPH of the design speed, then the existing curve may be retained according to UDOT's 3R standards. Most of the curves on this section of SR-12 fit the criteria.
- Sue Mosier stated that the problem with the vertical clearance throughout the corridor is the perception. People assume it is not high enough so they dart into the other lane trying to avoid hitting what is above them. Laurel Hagen suggested using signs that state the clearance height so people will know how high it is.
- Jim Catlin suggested utilizing two speed limits on the corridor. One speed for cars and one speed for large vehicles.
- John Mavor stated that there is a problem with the posted speed limit near Head-of-the-Rocks. The 30 MPH sign appears too soon. It should be posted with a 60 MPH sign followed by a 30 MPH warning sign for the curve.
- Allysia Angus stated that the Hogsback warning sign is not in the best location. She also stated that warning speed signs don't seem to be as effective as signs for steep grades and sharp curves.
- Keith Gailey stated that the posted speed through Boulder is too high. He said it doesn't make sense to go 40 MPH through town and then slow down to 35 MPH after you leave the town. He suggested the speed limit through Boulder be 35 MPH.

- H.G. Kunzler asked what the perception is of foreign drivers. John Mavor stated that if there are a lot of foreign travelers, then the signs should be more visual so they can understand them.
- Kim Clark asked the committee if there were any additional solutions that have not been discussed or questions they would like addressed.
 - Tod Wadsworth inquired as to what the legal responsibility of the committee is. What is the liability if something doesn't get done?
 - Myron Lee with UDOT answered that the liability lies with UDOT.
 - Kim Clark stated that legal liability is the reason standards and guidelines are utilized when designing roads. Rick Torgerson stated that if exceptions are made to the set guidelines, there is a substantial review of that change. He also stated that UDOT is not just looking at the present, but they are looking forward as well. The project looks to fix and address issues now to accommodate the future.
 - H.G. Kunzler asked a rhetorical question of the committee that if their name was on the stamp of approval on design plans that get bid for construction, would they be willing to accept responsibility for safety? Would the recommendations that they put forth be in the best interest of safety?
 - Sharol Bernardo asked how the committee balances the need for safety with the aesthetic changes that take place. Kim Clark stated that it comes back to the committee's vision. Allysia Angus stated that there are many ways to answer the safety questions.
 - Jim Catlin stated that he would feel more comfortable if the project team and committee did not use safety and roadway standards in the same sentence.
 - Sharol Bernardo asked whether the committee will be liable for decisions that are made. Kim Clark stated that the committee provides recommendations and ideas but they don't make decisions. Therefore, they have no liability.
 - Joe Gregory stated that FHWA, UDOT, and BLM make the decisions and sign the document.
 - H.G. Kunzler stated that H.W. Lochner would not carry alternatives forward that would reduce safety.
 - Jim Catlin asked whether the forest service is involved on this project. Rick Torgerson stated that they are involved but they chose not to be a signatory on the document. They will be involved in the review of the document.

8. *Evaluation Criteria*

- Kim Clark stated that the most important questions to ask when screening alternatives and developing evaluation criteria are:
 - Is it feasible?
 - Does it meet the project's purpose and need?

9. *Context Sensitive Committee Business*

- *Status of CSC Goals*
 - The following items have been covered so far:
 - Context
 - Needs
 - Evaluation Criteria

- Design Criteria
- Possible Solutions
- Ms. Clark asked the committee members what they would like to hear more about at the next committee meeting. The answers that were provided are as follows:
 - Jim Catlin would like additional accident analysis. He wants to know if the accidents would be eliminated if the road changed. H.G. Kunzler stated that the team is continuing to review the cause of accidents and that additional accident data will be gathered from Garfield County.
 - John Mavor stated that he would like to see illustrative examples of what some of the changes may look like. He would like to see some of the alternatives drawn up.
 - Jim Caltin asked for information on the distance effectiveness of headlights.
 - Vard Coombs stated that some of the rolling hills need to be filled in because vehicles hit deer and cows because their headlights aren't effective in lighting them.
- *Next Meeting*
 - August 9, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Boulder, Utah.

THANK YOU!

The previous summary is the writer's interpretation of the meeting discussion. If there are any discrepancies or items that need clarification or correction, please notify Kim Clark or Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner.

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Minutes

To: Attendees and Invitees Date: January 20, 2006

From: H.W. Lochner

Project: SR-12 Environmental Assessment
STP-0012(8)60E

Meeting Location: Boulder Town Hall
Boulder, Utah

Subject: Context Sensitive Committee Meeting #4 (August 9, 2005)

The SR-12 Project Team and the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on August 9, 2005 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Escalante, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Scott Brodie, Boulder Town
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Sandra Garcia-Aline, Federal Highway Administration
Laurel Hagen, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Dell LaFevre, Garfield County Commission and Ranching Community
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Committee Members Not Present:

Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council
Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner

Project Team Members:

Tyler Robirds, H.W. Lochner
Andrea Clayton, H.W. Lochner
Randi Shover, H.W. Lochner
Tod Wadsworth, Wadsworth Design Group

Additional Attendees:

Myron Lee, Utah Department of Transportation
Daryl Friant, Utah Department of Transportation
Angelo Papastamos, Utah Department of Transportation
Rachel Soderquist, Wadsworth Design Group

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda):

1. *Welcome*

- Kim Clark of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees.
 - Ms. Clark proceeded to review the day's agenda.

2. *Updates Since Last Meeting*

- *Committee Comments on Meeting Minutes*
 - None
- *Committee Member News*
 - Jim Catlin stated that research that has been conducted by Utah State University in Logan Canyon has shown that the improvements that were made, including straightening and widening roads, has actually led to a higher accident rate. Basic data also shows that accidents involving animals have increased in the improved areas as this is a migration corridor for deer and elk. The speed was also increased in the improved sections from a design speed of about 35-45 mph to a design speed of about 80 mph. Mr. Catlin suggested the committee look closely at the relationship between AASHTO standards and accident rates and how improvements impact driving speed. He also suggested contacting UDOT regarding the project to get more accident rates/data before and after the improvements were made.
 - Sandra Garcia-Aline stated that Logan Canyon was done over several years and several projects - section by section. She stated that they haven't added capacity, just shoulders. She also stated that she would be very interested in the studies that were performed. Jim Catlin stated that they have added a third passing lane in some sections and that the perception of a straighter, wider road has led to higher speeds.

3. *Overview of Project Activities*

- The project team is coordinating with BLM regarding WSA Boundaries and identifying its GIS data.
- Three copies of the draft Purpose and Need Report were made available for the committee to review. It is currently in internal review with UDOT and FHWA. It will be sent to the BLM for comments. A copy will then be distributed to the committee members for their comments.
- The project team presented the SR-12 design criteria to UDOT. At this point in time, the project team is leaning towards the 3R standards. At this juncture, the project is not considered a reconstruction. Once a more detailed survey has been conducted on the pavement condition, then it will be determined whether this will be a reconstruction.
- UDOT crews have surveyed key locations such as Boynton, Hole-in-the-Rock intersection, Calf Creek area, etc.
- Jim Catlin asked about the design standards regarding headlights. He wants to know what the design speed is to stop in time before a motorist hits a deer. Rick Torgerson stated that it will vary based on the vertical curve. Sharol Bernardo stated that hitting a deer is often unavoidable. She was going only 5 mph and a deer turned into the side of her car. Mr. Catlin stated that he wants to know how fast you can go on a perfectly straight road and still stop in time when a driver sees a deer. Kim Clark stated that AASHTO standards address

stopping sight distance. Mr. Catlin stated that he doesn't think that headlights can see as far as stopping sight distance. It was decided that the specifics of the design criteria and stopping sight distance would be discussed in more detail at the break.

- Some of the many solutions suggested by the public, agencies, and members of the committee have been drawn up into conceptual solutions to show the committee members. This was the result of requests made by the committee at meeting #3 to "see" or "visualize" some of the suggested solutions. The conceptual solutions that were shown at the meeting are at the following locations:
 - Hole-in-the-Rock intersection
 - Escalante to Head-of-the-Rocks bike path
 - Entrance to Head-of-the-Rocks
 - Vertical curves at the bottom of Head-of-the-Rocks (later referred to as the "camelbacks" by Dell LeFevre)
 - Sharp horizontal curve at the bottom of Head-of-the-Rocks (later referred to as the "tank" by Dell LaFevre)
 - Boynton Overlook area
 - Calf Creek bypass
 - Escalante Trailhead/Calf Creek Area
 - Calf Creek Area
 - Calf Creek Campground entrance
 - The Hogsback
- Garfield County accident data has been obtained but has not been incorporated into the draft Purpose and Need report. It is currently being evaluated to ensure that accidents are not being counted twice.
- Members of the project team will be attending and setting up an information booth at the Scenic Byway 12 Community Celebration on August 27th from 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne then proceeded to discuss the schedule for Phase I of the project and give an overview of what will be coming up in Phase II.
 - At this point in Phase I the project team has identified existing conditions, developed the draft Purpose and Need report (which will continue to develop as the project moves forward), and now are reviewing conceptual solutions to determine which ones to carry forward.
 - Allysia Angus asked at what point will a decision be made whether the document will be an EA or an EIS? Michelle Fishburne stated that UDOT and FHWA will determine the document type before Phase II.
 - Kim Clark stated that public involvement will continue throughout Phase II.
- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne then handed out a questionnaire to each of the committee members to get their feedback regarding their experience on the Context Sensitive Committee. They stated that the answers will be evaluated and will help determine the future of the committee.
- Michelle Fishburne then proceeded to discuss how the committee's and public's comments have been utilized. She stated that they have been incorporated into the draft Purpose and Need Report, the evaluation criteria, and the conceptual solutions.

4. *Purpose and Need Discussion*

- The draft Purpose and Need report for Phase I has been developed and is currently undergoing the review process. The outline of the report is as follows:
 - Introduction
 - Background
 - Other Related Actions
 - Project Development
 - Character of SR-12
 - Current Social and Economic Conditions
 - Purpose of the Proposed Project
 - Need for the Proposed Project
 - Community Outreach
 - Conclusion
- The context, as defined by the CSC and the public, has been captured in the following sections of the draft Purpose and Need report:
 - Project Development
 - Recent Transportation Studies
 - SR-12, Escalante to Boulder Improvement Study
 - SR-12, Escalante to Boulder Project Limits
 - Character of SR-12, Escalante to Boulder
 - Section 1 through 6
 - Current Social and Economic Conditions
- The purpose of the SR-12 Project has been defined as follows:
 - Provide sufficient right-of-way to perform adequate maintenance operations on and adjacent to SR-12
 - Provide safety improvements
 - Balance the needs of the various groups using the roadway
- The needs for the SR-12 Project have been defined as follows:
 - Problems maintaining the road
 - RS-2477 Right-of-Way/Wilderness Study Areas
 - Bridges
 - Roadway Surface
 - Slope/Shoulder Stability
 - Drainage/Erosion
 - Barriers and Guardrails
 - Miscellaneous Maintenance and Operation
 - Problems with Safety
 - Traffic and Travel Speeds
 - Geometrics
 - Road Width (Travel Lanes and Shoulders)
 - Sight Distance
 - Accident Data
 - Summary of Safety Concerns by Section
 - Problems with multiple user groups
 - Traffic Mix
 - Traffic Flow

- Bicycle Use
 - Roadside Parking
- Jim Catlin asked if the purpose of this project is to increase speed and reduce travel time. Sandra Garcia-Aline said that it is not, especially because SR-12 is a scenic byway. Michelle Fishburne added that a need to increase speed or reduce travel time had not been identified in any comments made from the public, agencies, or committee. Speed and travel-time have also not been mentioned as issues or problems at any of the previous meetings. Rick Torgerson stated that the reason the project is leaning towards the UDOT 3R standards is because the design will have greater flexibility to meet the needs of the project and not just full AASHTO standards. Kim Clark stated that the needs that have been identified are what the project team has heard from people during the early coordination that has been done.
 - John Mavor stated that the vast majority of users on SR-12 are not using it to get somewhere. They are here to enjoy the road and not speed through it.
 - Allysia Angus asked whether it is part of the project's goal to retain the character of SR-12. Michelle Fishburne said that it is a goal to retain the character and that the Purpose and Need statement goes into detail on the character of SR-12.
 - Jim Catlin asked whether the committee would be given an opportunity to view the Purpose and Need document. Michelle Fishburne stated that the committee would have the opportunity to view and comment on the Purpose and Need statement. However, internal review must be complete prior to the committee receiving a copy.
 - Dell LaFevre stated that he has seen people go 90 mph on SR-12. He stated that it is the fastest road in Garfield County and that people ignore posted speed limits and warning signs.
 - Angelo Papastamos stated that the purposes that have been identified are true to the context of the area. There are safety issues that need to be addressed and that a passing lane may be required in certain areas. Safety and preserving the environment are the issues, not moving people from point A to point B faster.
 - Jim Catlin stated that the curvier and slower areas of the road are safer and that is in contradiction with AASHTO standards. He asked whether the accident was caused by the road itself or whether there were mitigating factors involved. Kim Clark stated that the accident data has been detailed out in the Purpose and Need statement and that the data is also on the project maps. Dell LaFevre stated that alcohol is the cause of most of the accidents on SR-12.
 - At this point the committee took a break. (A copy of the draft Purpose and Need Report was later handed out to each committee member to review)

BREAK

5. Evaluation Criteria Discussion

- The evaluation criteria for this project is based on the purpose, needs, and context sensitive objectives identified by the public and the CSC members. The solutions at this stage would, at a minimum, meet the identified purpose and needs. The evaluation criteria will:
 - Focus on the outcomes that are the most important
 - Decide what to use as minimum performance standards

- The committee discussed the context sensitive objectives that were identified by the public and the members of the CSC and made some modifications. They are as follows:
 - Objectives:
 - Preserve the history
 - Contribute to the culture of the community
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - A project communities are proud of
 - The best for the community
 - Maintain SR-12 as the life-blood of the community
 - Contribute to a future for the young
 - Honor the history and the culture of the communities
 - Objectives:
 - Meet the transportation demands
 - Improve safety
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Meet the traffic demands
 - Grow to fit the increasing traffic
 - Some improvements
 - Make a little safer
 - Travel safely across
 - A safe and more beautiful road
 - Objectives:
 - Preserve the natural environment
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Do only what is absolutely necessary
 - Limit changes
 - Objectives:
 - Maintain the character of the road
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Enhance experiences
 - Objectives:
 - Maintain the visual appeal
 - Objectives:
 - Improve the ability to perform adequate maintenance operations appropriate to place
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Better maintenance
 - Road needs to be resurfaced
 - Concern regarding road conditions
 - Maintenance should be good quality and subtle
 - Objectives:
 - Balance the needs of the different modes of transportation
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Tourist traffic is difficult
 - Slow moving trucks and RVs
 - Summer traffic is really heavy for the size of the road

- There is a safety problem when it comes to bicycles
- Objectives:
 - Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway and environment
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Turnouts are needed
 - No more ugly barriers
 - Improvements need to be sensitive in order to preserve the landscape quality
 - Provide an alternative route for traffic to avoid Calf Creek and reduce traffic in Boulder
- Objectives:
 - Preserve water resources
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Preserve Calf Creek
- Objectives:
 - Incorporate science, research, and facts into the decision-making process
- Objectives:
 - Improve safety on SR-12
 - Vision/Context/Experiences:
 - Address safety along SR-12
 - Other areas along SR-12 need improvements
 - Dangerous curves located near Boulder
 - Danger from cattle on the road
- Jim Catlin stated he is concerned that the project will seek to meet the needs of and accommodate the dominant user and ignore the needs of the minority users. John Mavor said to be careful so the dominant user doesn't become the only user. Jim Catlin requested that another purpose of the project should be meeting the needs of the environment. Mr. Catlin and Michelle Fishburne discussed the transportation needs for the project for clarity. Mr. Catlin explained that he would like to insure that measures are taken to blend the disturbed areas along the road so that they will look natural and not stand-out like some of the existing side-slopes.
- Scott Brodie asked what exactly was meant by the objective "contribute to the economics of the communities." He is concerned that it is in reference to increasing the usage of SR-12. Sharol Bernardo stated that it doesn't mean an increased use it means make the users stop – slow down – and spend their money in the communities along the corridor. John Mavor stated that if the project comes to fruition, it would be beneficial to utilize local labor during construction.
- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne then proceeded to go over the evaluation criteria chart that was put together. The purpose of the chart is to gauge the committee's reaction to each suggested solution, determine whether a suggested solution meets the Purpose and Need and the context sensitive objectives, and to start a discussion between the committee members. They then proceeded to go through each purpose and the associated problems with each purpose. They are as follows:
 - **Purpose:** *Provide UDOT sufficient right-of-way to perform adequate maintenance operations.*
 - Insufficient right-of-way to maintain the road
 - Calf Creek Bridge is in poor condition

- Deteriorated roadway surface
- Slope/Shoulder instability
- Inability to clean culverts
- Difficult to find discharge points
- Inadequate and/or lack of side slope protection
- Lack of material borrow and disposal sites
- **Purpose: Provide safety improvements.**
 - Accommodation of future traffic (commuters and tourists)
 - Variable geometrics (curves do not meet posted speeds)
 - Horizontal/vertical curve combination
 - Lack of speed transition zones
 - Lack of area for adequate turnaround
 - Insufficient distance to stop or avoid an unexpected object
 - Excessive accidents involving animals
 - Excessive speed accidents
 - Conflicts due to cars moving at different speeds (i.e. slowing down to make a turn) (Hole-in-the-Rock Road, Calf Creek Campground, Kiva Koffehouse, Boynton Overlook, Boulder Dump)
 - Perception of insufficient vertical clearance
- **Purpose: Balance the needs of various groups using the roadway**
 - Lack of passing ability for different modes of transportation
 - Lack of roadway width to accommodate multiple users including bicycles and pedestrians
 - Seasonal peak traffic
 - Speed differential with different users
 - Roadside parking outside of designated areas
- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne also explained how the evaluation criteria utilized the context sensitive objectives. The following objectives were used in the evaluation criteria:
 - Preserve the history
 - Contribute to the economics and culture of the community
 - Meet the needs of the natural environment
 - Preserve water resources
 - Maintain the character of the road
 - Incorporate safety improvements that are consistent with the context of the roadway
 - Maintain and enhance the visual appeal
 - Incorporate science, research, and facts into open decision-making process
 - Improve ability to perform adequate maintenance operations appropriate to place

LUNCH

6. *Conceptual Solutions Discussion*

- Andrea Clayton with H.W. Lochner presented the Conceptual Solutions Discussion section. Ms. Clayton stated that these are not alternatives. They are merely suggested solutions that the project team has drawn up at the request of the committee. They should not in any way be seen as alternatives that are ready to be carried forward in the project. She also stated that the conceptual solutions do not include an all-encompassing list. They are a snapshot of

the approximately 450 suggested solutions the project team has received. The following concepts were shown to the committee. Under each concept is the list of comments from the committee and project team members:

- No Action
 - Andrea Clayton stated that as with every environmental study, a “No Action” alternative is offered as an option.
- No Action with Right-of-Way Acquisition (right-of-way undefined from Head-of-the-Rocks to Forest Service boundary)
- Hole-in-the-Rock Intersection
 - There is currently an interpretive sign study being conducted on behalf of the BLM that would incorporate an interpretive site near this intersection.
 - One concept was to add lanes to accommodate left-turn and right-turn movements.
 - Allysia Angus stated that an interpretive site was planned at this location. BLM does not intend to move it to Hole-in-the-Rock Road.
- Escalante to Head-of-the-Rocks Bike Path (separate from road but within right-of-way)
- Entrance to Head-of-the-Rocks: simultaneous vertical and horizontal curves
 - One concept was to flatten the existing vertical curve to increase sight distance for the horizontal curve. Jim Catlin stated that flattening the vertical curve would increase speed.
 - Another concept was to include additional signing to warn motorists of the upcoming curve combination and reduced speed.
- Vertical Curves at the Bottom of Head-of-the-Rocks (referred to as the “camelbacks” by Dell LaFevre) (sight distance is limited in this section)
 - One concept was to add a passing lane or pullout on the uphill sides of the vertical curves. Members of the committee wanted to know if lanes would be added in both directions and how long would they be. The project team responded stating that the drawn up solution has not been engineered. It is merely an illustration to show the committee what potential visual impacts there would be associated with this solution.
 - Dell LaFevre stated that he lost 7 cattle in this area. He also stated that he would lose 10-15 cattle a year prior to cattle fencing being installed. He feels this is the area where a bicyclist will end up getting hit.
 - Jim Catlin prefers pullouts to full passing lanes.
- Sharp Horizontal Curve at the Bottom of Head-of-the-Rocks (referred to as the “tank” by Dell LaFevre).
 - One concept was to increase the radius of the turn and widen it out to increase sight distance. Dell LaFevre stated that this curve, as it is, would not allow for two large vehicles to pass each other without colliding.
 - Another suggestion was to build out instead of cutting back the rock. The committee is concerned with the unsightliness of fill material. Allysia Angus asked Jim Catlin and Laurel Hagen what is an acceptable amount to cut away from the rock. They stated that it must only be done from a safety standpoint. Laurel Hagen stated that any more than 10 feet would be unacceptable.
 - At this point Dell LaFevre stated that the road is the way it is now because of blasting. It is part of the original creation of the road.
 - Jim Catlin suggested maintaining a 20 mph curve while providing a wider turning radius.

- Boynton Overlook
 - One concept was to lengthen the existing pullout and add a parking area across the road. Scott Brodie and Sue Mosier did not like the idea of the extra parking area. They felt it would be dangerous for people to walk across SR-12 near a curve to get to the overlook area. Members of the committee also were curious to know what the terrain is like where the proposed expansion might be.
 - There was also concern that adding capacity would only cause additional problems.
- Calf Creek Bypass
 - One suggestion from the public was to build a bypass route around the Calf Creek Area. The committee members were not supportive of this idea.
- Escalante River Trailhead/Calf Creek Area
 - One concept was to widen SR-12 in the Calf Creek area by utilizing a cantilever system over Calf Creek. This concept had mixed reactions from the committee members.
- Barrier Options
 - Andrea Clayton then showed the committee different photos of barriers that are more aesthetically pleasing and blend in more with the environment than the Jersey barriers.
- Calf Creek Area
 - In the area near Calf Creek where the guardrail is currently holding up the slope, an artistic rendering was shown utilizing colored shotcrete to stabilize the slope. This same rendering was shown to the committee members at meeting #3.
 - Allysia Angus wondered about using natural material instead of shotcrete. She stated that the problem with shotcrete is that vegetation does not grow in it.
- Calf Creek Campground Entrance
 - There is currently a sign after the entrance to Calf Creek stating “R.V.’s over 25 ft. not recommended in campground.” Committee members felt this sign needs to be moved before the entrance so R.V’s don’t pull in to the campground and then have to try and get back out.
 - One concept that was shown for the entrance to Calf Creek Campground was to realign the driveway approach at an angle closer to 90 degrees. Allysia Angus stated she is concerned about this solution as there is a BLM sign at that location that would be impacted and that the approach would be too steep.
- Hogsback
 - One concept utilized a retaining wall made of shotcrete that is two feet high so the view is not obstructed.
 - Another concept was to do a split-alignment on the Hogsback.
 - The last concept that was shown was to add a rock retaining wall and a bike/pedestrian lane into the side of the mountain below the Hogsback. Allysia Angus stated that if either of the two afore mentioned concepts were done there would likely be massive public outcry. Laurel Hagen stated that the project shouldn’t change the character of the road in this area.
- The project team asked if the committee had any other items regarding conceptual solutions they would like to add.

- Dell LaFevre stated that the old road needs to be preserved. Jim Catlin and Allysia Angus stated that they would like to have the old road mapped with a Global Positioning System (GPS).

7. *Evaluation Exercise*

- There was not time to complete this item.

8. *Evaluation Exercise Discussion*

- There was not time to complete this item.

9. *Future Committee Involvement*

- Kim Clark and Michelle Fishburne asked the committee members what they see as the future for the committee.
 - Sandra Garcia-Aline asked how the committee felt about continuing on an as needed basis when critical milestones come up. She also stated that when the project team begins weighing alternatives, they would like to hear the committee's perspective together rather than individually.
 - Allysia Angus stated that the committee has developed a relationship that allows them to come together and voice different opinions. She said that the committee is finally into the "meat" of the project and she would like to meet at least once more.
 - Laurel Hagen stated that the information she was given at this meeting is what she has been waiting for. She also said that meeting together as a group is useful and allows the committee to discuss specifics together.
 - John Mavor stated that he does enjoy meeting with the committee but he has many time constraints that make it difficult for him to take a whole day to meet. He wondered if it was possible to meet in cyberspace instead. Kim Clark stated that the project team has the tools and resources to do it that way but it would have to be limited to smaller groups.
 - Jim Catlin stated that he is heartened by the outcome of the committee meetings and thinks it will lead to a better result down the road. He stated that he prefers to meet face-to-face.
 - Scott Brodie stated that he would like to get the conceptual ideas ahead of time so he can prepare his response to the ideas before the next meeting.
 - John Mavor said he would like to see more of Tod's photographic renderings. He stated that the visual images are worth 1,000 words and that a person can tell immediately whether they like it (the idea) or not.
 - Allysia Angus suggested that when showing extreme design solutions, show them in a sequence with the less extreme ideas leading up to the most drastic.

10. *Next Steps*

- It was decided that the project team will determine major milestones in Phase II where it may be beneficial to bring the committee together.
- The next meeting is scheduled for October 21, 2005 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the new visitor's center in Escalante. (The meeting date was subsequently changed to the first or second week in November. Exact date TBA.)

Context Sensitive Committee Meeting Minutes

To: Attendees and Invitees Date: January 20, 2006

From: H.W. Lochner

Project: SR-12 Environmental Assessment
STP-0012(8)60E

Meeting Location: BLM Visitor Center
Escalante, Utah

Subject: Context Sensitive Committee Meeting #5 (November 7, 2005)

The SR-12 Project Team and the Context Sensitive Committee held a meeting on November 7, 2005 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in Escalante, Utah. The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Committee Member Attendees:

Allysia Angus, US Bureau of Land Management
Sharol Bernardo, Garfield County Travel Council
Scott Brodie, Boulder Town
Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project
Sandra Garcia-Aline, Federal Highway Administration
Sue Mosier, Escalante/Boulder Chamber of Commerce
Rick Torgerson, Utah Department of Transportation

Committee Members Not Present:

Vard Coombs, Garfield County School District
Laurel Hagen, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
Dell LaFevre, Garfield County Commission and Ranching Community
John Mavor, Bicycle Community
Marlene Stowe, Escalante City Council

Facilitators:

Kim Clark, H.W. Lochner
Michelle Fishburne, H.W. Lochner

Project Team Members:

Tyler Robirds, H.W. Lochner
Andrea Clayton, H.W. Lochner
HG Kunzler, H.W. Lochner
Christy Shumate, H.W. Lochner
Mike Brehm, Brehm Environmental, LLC
Steve Trimble
Tod Wadsworth, Wadsworth Design Group

The following is a summary of the meeting (all italicized items were included on the original agenda):

1. *Welcome*

- Michelle Fishburne of H.W. Lochner (Lochner) welcomed the attendees.

2. *Project Visioning Review: Context Sensitive Committee*

- Ms. Fishburne proceeded to review the committee's work to date, describing CSC goals that have been achieved and noting that the Project Team has learned a tremendous amount of information from the committee. She reiterated the CSC principles of being an asset to the community, being compatible with the environment, and addressing the transportation need and noted that this process involves a balancing of numerous resources and objectives. Ms. Fishburne then reviewed the overall project approach and explained that Phase 1 of the project is concluding and Phase 2 of the project will continue to include public involvement and input from the CSC.
- Ms. Fishburne recapped the previous four CSC meetings:
 - Meeting 1 – Established context, vision, and needs for the project
 - Meeting 2 – Identified additional needs and CSC objectives
 - Meeting 3 – Developed design criteria for improvements and discussed characteristics of the existing roadway
 - Meeting 4 – Identified conceptual solutions for problems
- Ms. Fishburne explained that this 5th CSC meeting would include evaluation of conceptual solutions.

3. *Updates Since Last Meeting*

- *Committee Comments on Meeting Minutes*
 - Allysia Angus requested that on page 10 of the minutes the wording "did not like" in reference to the CSC's opinion of something be revised to "were not supportive of."
 - Ms. Angus also asked that the minutes clarify that at the Calf Creek Campground she is more concerned with the steepness of the driveway than being required to move the BLM sign.
 - Kim Clark noted that these changes would be made to the minutes and the minutes would be redistributed to the CSC and posted on the website.
- *Committee Member News*
 - Michelle Fishburne stated that comments on the Draft Purpose and Need Technical Report were received from BLM, FHWA, and Jim Catlin. She asked that if any other CSC members wished to comment on the document that they speak with either she or Kim Clark at the break.
 - Michelle Fishburne then asked Jim Catlin to share some concerns he had raised with the Project Team via email regarding travel speeds at night, average daily traffic volume estimates, accident rates, and bike path standards.
 - Mr. Catlin noted page 19 of the Purpose and Need Technical Report contains a table detailing accident rates along the SR-12 project corridor and noted that the majority of accidents involving animal collisions occur at night in higher-speed areas. Mr. Catlin asked the Project Team to share information regarding nighttime sight distance and speed with the committee and to include this information in the report.

HG Kunzler explained that a review of national standards related to sight distance and standard head light distance revealed that most beams illuminate 350 feet, which would equate to a speed of no more than 45 mph to allow for stopping. He added that at increased speeds, additional stopping distance would be required.

- Sharol Bernardo observed that it is generally the responsibility of the driver to adjust speed based on driving conditions. Kim Clark pointed out that speed limits are set based on the 85th percentile of drivers. Allysia Angus asked if UDOT uses mandatory speed reductions in other areas for similar purposes. Sue Mosier proposed signs that contain both daytime and nighttime speed limits. Rick Torgerson pointed out that he has not seen this done in Utah but that it may warrant consideration.
- Allysia Angus noted that cattle fencing has been installed along the majority of the corridor, particularly in Section 1 where animal collision accidents have been a problem.
- Scott Brodie said that he has observed the use of large, flashing signs when cattle drives are in progress and perhaps the use of temporary warning signs would be beneficial.
- Jim Catlin questioned average daily traffic volumes (ADT) presented in the Draft Technical Report, noting that he had completed an unofficial, independent count and determined the volumes in the report to be high. HG Kunzler explained that the figure presented in the report (1230 ADT) was accurate for the section from Escalante to Hole-in-the-Rock Road; however, there is a drop-off to 735 ADT between Hole-in-the-Rock Road and RP 84 and then again to 585 ADT between RP 84 and Boulder. This will be revised in the Technical Report. Mr. Kunzler added that the Level of Service (LOS) on SR-12 has not been a concern of this project to date. LOS on this section of SR-12 is currently LOS A and is anticipated to drop to LOS B in 2030. Scott Brodie pointed out that area residents will be more likely to notice the decrease in level of service than will tourists. Kim Clark added that motorists following slow-moving tourist traffic or recreational vehicles is not a part of level of service analysis; but that there is a perception for these drivers as they get frustrated behind slower moving vehicles.
- Jim Catlin then asked about accident rates per section along SR-12 and how the accident rate data presented in the Draft Technical Report compares to statewide averages or goals and to other sections of SR-12. Kim Clark explained that the current UDOT expected accident rate for a rural highway is 2.3. She also noted that the average accident severity is 1.7, while on SR-12 it is 2.7. Accidents along SR-12 are more severe than the state average. Mr. Catlin said that it would be interesting to know where along SR-12 accidents are most frequent (i.e. which section of road is most dangerous). Michelle Fishburne noted that the Corridor Transportation Plan for SR-12 does indicate that there are sections of the road that have higher accident rates than between Escalante and Boulder. Ms. Clark reminded everyone that there are other issues under consideration, including maintenance and the multi-modal use of the road. Sandra Garcia-Aline added that this project focuses on the section of SR-12 from Escalante to Boulder, and therefore, it is not necessarily appropriate to discuss other sections of SR-12. Mr. Kunzler also explained that accident rates are calculated by counting and can be modified based on the length of highway being

evaluated; therefore, one must look carefully at numbers being compared. Sharol Bernardo noted that she has observed traffic in the area over a number of years and has noted problems with older people driving slowly, others driving very fast, and commuters traveling at a normal speed; therefore, she said, it will be important to consider the variety of users on the road as they will likely not change. Ms. Clark agreed that there is a problem with speed differentials and various groups using the road. Mr. Kunzler added that when there is a speed differential of greater than 15 mph, there is generally an increase in accidents.

- Kim Clark added that Jim Catlin had expressed some concerns regarding recent bike paths constructed in Utah and that he and Allysia Angus had provided some information on bike path designs and standards. She pointed out that this information is displayed in the room and asked that committee members take time during a break to look at the information and discuss it with Mr. Catlin.
- Jim Catlin posed a question for the “parking lot” – how are speed limits determined and what percent of people are speeding?

4. *Conceptual Ideas Discussion*

- HG Kunzler said that more than 450 ideas for improving SR-12 were collected during CSC meetings and public involvement. He explained that the Project Team has reviewed these, categorized them, and consolidated them into five major categories:
 - Do nothing
 - Education
 - Regulatory action
 - Build bypass
 - Improve existing SR-12 (which includes adding shoulders, bike lanes, signing, passing areas, etc.)
- Mr. Kunzler then recommended conceptual ideas that should not be carried forward for further study, including building a bypass. This idea is not feasible due to the level of impacts to resources.
 - Jim Catlin asked what criteria were being considered when evaluating the ideas. Mr. Kunzler explained that the Project Team looked at the established purpose and need for the project and examined each idea to determine if any and/or how many problems the idea would address. Jim asked if engineering feasibility or cost were considered, and Michelle Fishburne responded that these will be considered as secondary screening but currently a more qualitative analysis can be used to determine that this concept is not consistent with the CSC objectives or minimizing impacts. The Bypass would require additional crossings at Escalante River, Calf Creek, impact WSAs, and is not consistent with the BLM management plans. The committee agreed that putting more resources into looking at these concepts is not warranted. Sandra Garcia-Aline stressed that these are conceptual ideas only and are not considered true alternatives at this time. Ms. Angus pointed out that the improve existing SR-12 idea could also include parts of the other ideas, such as education or regulatory actions. Ms. Garcia-Aline agreed that the ideas do not need to stand alone, but can and likely will be combined to develop alternatives for the project.

- Mr. Kunzler noted that the Project Team has determined that several ideas should be carried forward, including the Do Nothing, Educational, and Regulatory Action ideas. He said that the Project Team would like input from the committee on the Regulatory Action idea and the improve existing SR-12 to clarify options to be considered based on the context of the road. At this point, Mr. Kunzler used hand tools to explain what he meant by context – he pointed out that he would not use the same tools to perform different jobs and added that the same is true for improvements along SR-12. The Project Team would like for the committee to provide input on which “tools” for improvement should be used at different locations along SR-12.

5. *Evaluation of Conceptual Ideas Group Exercise*

- HG Kunzler and Kim Clark introduced a group exercise for committee members to begin evaluating the conceptual ideas. Six tables were spread across the room, each with mapping of existing conditions for one road segment. In addition, a mylar overlay was provided at each section with suggestions for improvements to SR-12 developed by the Project Team. Mr. Kunzler and Ms. Clark divided the committee into two groups of two and one group of three and asked that they spend approximately 20 minutes discussing each section. Ms. Clark provided a table of the conceptual ideas and options, as well as needs and problems addressed by each idea/option, and asked that the groups evaluate the ideas/options based on these criteria.

6. *Evaluation of Conceptual Ideas Group Exercise (continued)*

- After reviewing the first sections, the group broke for lunch. Upon returning, committee members asked to spend additional time on this exercise. The Project Team agreed and each group, instead of evaluating ideas for all six road sections, evaluated ideas for two road sections in detail.

7. *Conclude Exercise*

- Michelle Fishburne asked that a representative from each group come forward to present the group’s evaluation. She also asked that for each section every member of the committee identify their “extreme concerns” for that section.
 - **Section 1** – This section was reviewed by Jim Catlin and Sandra Garcia-Aline. They noted the following ideas for the section:
 - Provide a separate bike path, perhaps using the existing power line corridor, using a cement treatment versus asphalt. [Allysia Angus noted that BLM’s General Management Plan would have to be considered for placement of a separate bike path. She also said that she would not be supportive of using the power line as a path, but would support analysis of separate bike routes in the area.]
 - No need for barriers east of Escalante, instead perhaps side rumble strips could be used.
 - Consider a night time speed reduction due to the high number of accidents involving wildlife in this area. [Rick Torgerson suggested also looking at using deer fencing to funnel deer to a specific crossing point. Mr. Catlin argued that the problem is not the wildlife crossings but the speed vehicles travel. Ms. Angus suggested adding signage, perhaps with additional signs as needed seasonally.]

- If a separate bike path is not possible, consider adding 4-foot shoulders on each side of the road for bikes.
- At Hole-in-the-Rock Road, move the wayside onto Hole-in-the-Rock Road instead of on SR-12, add protected left turn lanes, and add directional signs. [Ms. Angus noted that she would like to retain a wayside along SR-12 to share the Hole-in-the-Rock story and house the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument entrance sign but would be supportive of moving it from its current location.]
- Use a turnout instead of a passing lane at RP 68 to RP 69.
- Add speed transition rumble strips and signing to alert drivers.
- **Section 1 Extreme Concerns**
 - No hill cuts (2)
 - Hole-in-the-Rock Road turnout is unsafe (3)
 - Concerned about locating a bike path too far from the road (2)
 - New signage for shared road showing a large vehicle, a car, and a bike
 - Need to make safer route for bikers
- **Section 2** – This section was reviewed by Allysia Angus and Sharol Bernardo. They noted the following ideas for the section:
 - Add 2 to 4 feet shoulders on each side of the road for bikers. A larger shoulder would encourage people to pull off of the road and park. [Mr. Catlin proposed that shoulders are not necessary on downhill sections of road as bikes are traveling closer to vehicle speeds downhill.
 - Use of the Cream Cellar Route for bikes is probably not appropriate due to steep terrain and administrative constraints of the Wilderness Study Area.
 - Passing lanes are not needed because it is a slow-speed, short section of road; however, a pullout could be used.
 - BLM to review where people currently stop along the road.
 - Use superelevation in curves.
 - Look at signage in speed transition zones; use rumble strips only in pedestrian crossing areas.
 - Instead of a barrier at RP 70.5-71, use a retaining wall below road level to stabilize.
- **Section 2 Extreme Concerns**
 - Retain aesthetics (3)
 - No passing lanes, use pullouts
 - Consistency of treatments throughout corridor (2)
 - Do not discount bike lanes on downhill sections, but look at adding downhill lanes without overall widening
- **Section 3** – This section was reviewed by Allysia Angus and Sharol Bernardo and by Jim Catlin and Sandra Garcia-Aline. They noted the following ideas for this section:
 - Add 2 to 4 feet shoulders for bikes, as it is probably not feasible to have a separate bike path in this section.
 - Passing lanes in both directions are excessive; use pullouts instead.
 - If there are still active cattle operations in this section, consider fencing.
 - Do not use wildlife fencing.
 - Consider signage for speed transitions rather than rumble strips.

- Do not alter vertical curves; instead slow traffic with signing to improve sight distance.
- Consider increased police enforcement for speeding.
- **Section 3 Extreme Concerns**
 - Use pullouts instead of passing lanes (2)
 - Maintain aesthetics and experience
 - If retain vertical curves, need shoulders or separate path for bikes
 - Look at separate bike path if possible
 - Correct drainage/maintenance problems in vertical sag locations
- **Section 4** – This section was reviewed by Rick Torgerson, Scott Brodie, and Sue Mosier. They noted the following ideas for this section:
 - At Boynton Overlook, do not add parking on the south side of the road and add a crosswalk; instead expand parking on the north side of the road.
 - If possible, use shorter, 18-inch barriers.
 - At Kiva Coffee House, use existing parking as a wayside and eliminate proposed wayside.
 - Add 2 to 4 feet shoulders uphill, but no additional shoulders downhill.
 - Replace Calf Creek Bridge and add retaining wall to protect the road from further erosion. [Alyssia Angus noted that there are Civilian Conservation Corps era walls in that area that should be preserved if possible. Jim Catlin added that the character of a new bridge should be consistent with the overall character of the existing road.]
 - Balance aesthetics and maintenance issues.
 - Evaluate campground entrance and eliminate overflow parking on SR-12.
 - No more than one pullout east of Calf Creek.
 - Remove existing jersey barrier and replace with retaining wall and/or low barrier. Perhaps shift road east into the rock.
 - At Hogsback, make no changes, use on-road bike lanes with signing and reduced speed, and limit parking by removing extra asphalt.
 - **Section 4 Extreme Concerns**
 - No passing lanes (3)
 - Maintain character of road (3)
 - Fix areas where erosion is a problem (3)
 - No additional parking on south side of road at Boynton Overlook
 - Do not change the Hogsback
- **Section 5** – This section was reviewed by Rick Torgerson, Scott Brodie, and Sue Mosier. They noted the following ideas for this section:
 - Add shoulders for bikes but discourage parking or consider a separate bike path from Hell's Backbone Road to proposed interpretive/day use area.
 - Add passing lane entering Section 6 on one side only.
 - Consider signage for deer crossings and night time speed reductions.
 - **Section 5 Extreme Concerns**
 - Speeding (2)
 - Wider shoulders encourage faster travel speeds (2)
 - Need wildlife crossing signs

- Accommodate bikes
 - **Section 6** – This section was reviewed by Sandra Garcia-Aline and Jim Catlin
 - Add a separate bike path or uphill bike lanes.
 - Add warning signs in the vicinity of the landfill turnoff.
 - Use side rumble strips at RP 85 instead of a barrier.
 - Better delineate parking/pullout at the existing wayside pullout.
 - Add cattle fencing where appropriate.
 - Add warning signs at the entrance/exit to the gas station or consider restricting access.
 - Clearer speed transition area before RP 84.
 - Tie to existing and planned pedestrian facilities in Boulder.
 - **Section 6 Extreme Concerns**
 - Speeding, especially between the gas station and the town
 - Speed limit in Boulder
8. *Wrap Up*
- Michelle Fishburne summarized the meeting, noting that the Project Team now has a good understanding of which conceptual ideas to carry forward.
 - Jim Catlin requested that an additional purpose be added to the Phase 1 Technical Report – to maintain the character of the road. The Project Team noted that this is a CSC objective and would not stand alone as a purpose for a transportation project. Allysia stated that she agreed that it would not be the purpose for the transportation project but does need be included. It was noted that the entire project approach is based on the sensitive nature and character of the road and that we thought we had captured this in the report. The character of the road is what will be used to evaluate the alternatives. Mr. Catlin added that he would like to have it at least written in the report specifically that purposes “will be carried out in a way that maintains the character of the road”.
9. *Project Milestones: Phase II*
- Phase II of the project will include development of preliminary alternatives and completion of an environmental document for the project.
10. *Future of the Context Sensitive Committee*
- The Project Team would like for the committee to continue to meet at project milestones. They propose that the committee meet after preliminary alternatives are developed and environmental impacts are identified and meet again after the public hearing.
 - Allysia Angus requested a joint meeting of the Byway Committee and the CSC committee.